DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 302 SO 014 069

AUTHOR	Willie, Charles V.; Greenblatt, Susan L.
TITLE	The Stages in a Scholar's Life.
INSTITUTION	Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. Graduate School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	[Oct 81]
GRANT	NIE-G-80-0035
NOTE	352p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC15 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Adult Development; *Black Achievement; *Black Education; *Black Leadership; Career Development; Case Studies; College Environment; Comparative Analysis; *Family Role; Social Science Research
IDENTIFIERS	Clark (Kenneth B); Franklin (John Hope); Holden (Matthew); Lewis (W Arthur); Turner (Darwin T)

ABSTRACT

A major purpose of this study was to identify the five most outstanding black scholars in the social sciences and humanities in the United States and to determine how they achieved eminence. The study focuses on their unfolding careers, the decisive events in their lives, interconnections in their life histories, and social interaction between them and others in society. Five hundred and fifty-four members of social science and humanities professional associations ranked and nominated the black scholars. These respondents also filled out a brief questionnaire that included information on their own educational and occupational mobility and success. The five nominated scholars were John Hope Franklin, W. Arthur Lewis, Kenneth B. Clark, Matthew Holden, Jr., and Darwin T. Turner. These scholars were asked questions about family background and economic circumstances; community race-relations climate; parent's philosophy of education; experiences in school, college, and graduate education; and career development. Using the event-structure theoretical framework of Allport, the critical events in the life histories of the five scholars were identified and case studies prepared. Among the findings are that career, education, and family development processes are relatively independent in that each process has a life-range of its own and a sequence of stages. The last part of the document contains a survey of the education and careers of respondents, which includes a demographic analysis of the study sample and an examination of career patterns by age and race. Last, the five outstanding scholars are compared to the national sample which ranked them. (NE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NIE-G-80-0035

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED219302

THE STAGES IN A SCHOLAR'S LIFE

by

Charles V. Willie and Susan L. Greenblatt
Harvard Graduate School of Education
Cambridge, Massachusetts

SO 014 069

Preface

Studies of racial and ethnic minorities usually are designed as studies of social problems. Especially is this so when ideal-type models are used. Racial and ethnic groups are analyzed to determine how and why they deviate from the norm.

Our study was deliberately designed to turn this custom around. We set out to discover the most outstanding black scholars in the social sciences and humanities in the United States and to determine how they achieved eminence.

We did not assume that scholarly excellence among blacks would differ from that among other population groups. But we did assume that the process of attainment might differ for minority and majority populations, due to their unequal access to power and other resources. One group is dominant and the other is subdominant in terms of power and authority relationships. This could make a difference.

We would have preferred a study-design that facilitated a comprehensive comparative analysis of black and white scholars. But resources were insufficient. Thus the case studies were of black scholars only because not much is known about the developmental process in blacks of high achievement. However, the analysis of our survey data is of black and white scholars.

Scholarship ultimately is for the benefit of society. We decided to use the reputational approach as a way of identifying outstanding scholars. There are dangers in the use of this approach in that creative people often stand alone and not with the crowd. In the end, however, their work must be vindicated by others who benefit from it. Thus, we accepted the risks of reputational analysis in identifying outstanding scholars as more appropriate than our own bias or that of a small panel of advisors. We believe that the life histories of the five scholars selected attest to the validity of our approach.

All studies in race are delicate and sometimes dangerous adventures. From whose point of view should data be interpreted -- that of the minority or that of the majority? We decided to include judgments from both. Thus, the reputational phase of the study obtained judgments from professionals who identify with minority and majority groups. The outstanding scholars included in this study were identified as outstanding by all.

The basic reason for sampling the memberships of professional associations was to obtain a representative rating of the scholars nominated. However, we recognized that the raters who were randomly selected provided a modest opportunity to compare the career development process of black and white professional scholars, especially in terms of their initial and current jobs and the association, if any, of their family and educational experiences with their similar or different levels of achievement.

This book, in essence, is a study in the stages of adult development, with special emphasis on humanistic and social science scholars. It focuses on the unfolding careers of successful people and identifies the decisive events in their lives. As such, it is a study in the area of human development that embraces both social psychology and sociology.

Presented also is an analysis of the structural supports that sustain the professional careers of scholars. Particular attention is given to the function of family and education in career development. This study, then, is one of social institutions and their interrelationships as manifested in the lives of professional scholars. These data reveal principles pertaining to social institutions, the sociology of the professions, and the sociology of science.

Indirectly this is a study in higher education and race relations. It analyzes the association between the college or university one attends, the rank of academic appointment, and the income received by race. In this connection it throws further light on the issue of the association, if any, between race and social class where social class (professional status) is held more or less constant while race and other characteristics vary.

In summary, the information contained in this book should be of practical benefit to young scholars who are in the process of building their careers and of theoretical value to research in sociology, psychology, and in the broader areas of race relations, human development, and higher education.

Susan Greenblatt assumed primary responsibility for preparing the survey data for analysis and Charles Willie was primarily responsible for preparing the case studies. Elfred Anthony Pinkard served as research assistant. Katharine O. Parker provided expert editorial assistance; and Betty Blake was the project secretary. The five outstanding scholars -- Kenneth B. Clark, John Hope Franklin, Matthew Holden, Jr., W. Arthur Lewis, and Darwin T. Turner -- were generous with their time and graciously assisted by granting interviews and reviewing their biographical statements. Without their cooperation in revealing the details of their unfolding careers, this book could not be written. All glory and honor to them for their unselfish ways and also to Mamie Clark, Gladys Isabel

Lewis, and Maggie Jean Turner who provided additional information about the way of life of their spouses.

We are grateful to the National Institute of Education for support of this study on Characteristics that Contribute to Excellence Among Black Scholars through a grant (NIE-G-80-0035). Antoine Garibaldi provided helpful oversight as NIE project officer. The coauthors of this report are solely responsible for the interpretations presented herein, particularly those for which they assumed primary responsibility. The contents do not necessarily reflect the position of the funding agency, and no official endorsement of these materials should be inferred.

October, 1981
Cambridge, Massachusetts

List of Tables

Table

1-1 Criteria of Outstanding Professional Status for Black Scholars in the Humanities and in the Social Sciences

2-1 The Sample by Academic Area of Responding Individuals

3-1 Stages in a Scholar's Career (Combined Experiences of Franklin, Lewis, Clark, Holden, Turner)

3-2 Stages in the Education of a Scholar's Career (Combined Experiences of Franklin, Lewis, Clark, Holden, Turner)

3-3 Stages in the Family of a Scholar's Career (Combined Experiences of Franklin, Lewis, Clark, Holden, Turner)

9-1 Race of Respondents

9-2 U.S. Regional Data by Race

9-3 Age by Race

9-4 Race by Sex

9-5 Respondents with Doctoral Degrees

9-6 Predominant Race of College Where Bachelor's Degree Was Obtained

9-7 Type of Organization of Employment

9-8 Type of Work

9-9 Current Job Rank for Academics

9-10 Satisfaction with Professional Position

9-11 Income

9-12 Current Annual Salary of 264 Scholars, 1980

9-13 Age and Salary Distribution of 264 Scholars, 1980

9-14 Education of Parents

9-15 Occupation of Parents

10-1 Sex by Age and Race

10-2 First Employment Organization by Age and Race

10-3 Type of First Position by Age and Race

10-4 First Job Satisfaction by Age and Race

10-5 Predominant Race at College of First Employment by Age and Race

10-6 Rank of First College by Age and Race

10-7 First Job Rank for College Teachers by Age and Race

10-8 Current Employment Organization by Age and Race

10-9 Type of Current Position by Age and Race

10-10 Current Job Satisfaction by Age and Race

10-11 Predominant Race at College of Current Employment by Age and Race

10-12 Rank of School of Current Employment by Race and Age

10-13 Current Job Rank for College Teaching by Age and Race

10-14 Current Salary by Age and Race

11-1 Predominant Race of College Where Black Scholar Obtained B.A. Degree

11-2 Predominant Race of College Where Black Scholar Obtained B.A. by Predominant Race of College Employment

11-3 Employment Category of Black Scholars by Predominant Race of College Where B.A. Was Obtained

11-4 Employment Rank of Black Scholars by Predominant Race of College Where B.A. Was Obtained

11-5 Current Salary of Black Scholars by Predominant Race of College Where B.A. Was Obtained

11-6 Current Salary by Age by Predominant Race of College Where B.A. Was Obtained

11-7 Current Salary of Black Scholars by Racial Category of College Where B.A. Was Obtained

11-8 Current Employment Rank of Black Scholars by Racial Category of College from Which B.A. Was Obtained

11-9 Barron's Ratings of Colleges

11-10 Race of College Where B.A. Was Obtained by Ranking of College of Current Employment for Blacks Who Currently Are Employed at Predominantly White Colleges

Table of Contents

Chapter Page

Part I Theories, Methods, Data

Chapter 1 The Components of Achievement and Definitions of Outstanding Professional Status 1

Occupation and Social Mobility 4

Parents and Offspring: Intergenerational Effects 7

Education and Social Mobility 10

Definitions of Outstanding Professional Status 15

Chapter 2 Life-History and Survey-Analysis Methods of Investigation 21

Survey 22

Case Study 28

Part II Life Histories 34

Chapter 3 Career, Education, and Family Stages 35

The Levinson Tradition 36

Our Assumptions and Approach 38

Career Stages 41

Other Research 44

Educational Stages 49

Family Stages 51

Conclusion 55

Chapter 4 John Hope Franklin, the Historian Who Understands 60

Influence on the Field of History and Recognition by Peers 62

Scholarship 63

Family Background 65

Education 68

Chapter		Page
Chapter 4	John Hope Franklin (continued)	
	Career	71
	Public and Professional Honors	76
	Personal Characteristics	77
	Analytic Summary	79
Chapter 5	W. Arthur Lewis, a Flexible and Many-Sided Economist	83
	A New Economic Model	84
	Peer and Public Recognition	86
	Family Background	88
	Education	91
	Career	92
	Personal Characteristics	97
	Analytic Summary	100
Chapter 6	Kenneth B. Clark, A Psychologist Committed to Justice and Equality	104
	Brown v. Board of Education	105
	Teaching and Community Service	107
	Family Background	110
	Education	113
	Career	118
	Personal Characteristics	126
	Analytic Summary	127
Chapter 7	Matthew Holden, Jr., a Political Scientist Who Cares About the Ordinary	130
	A Professional Policy-Maker	131
	Family Background	136
	Education	140
	Career	143

Chapter Page

Chapter 7 Matthew Holden, Jr. (continued)

Personal Characteristics.............................. 148

Analytic Summary.............................. 149

Chapter 8 Darwin T. Turner, an Objective and Sympathetic Literary Critic... 153

Literature and the Black Experience.............................. 154

Family Background.............................. 158

Education.............................. 159

Career.............................. 164

Reputation Among Peers.............................. 172

Personal Characteristics.............................. 172

Analytic Summary.............................. 174

Part III Education and Career: A Survey of the Study Sample.................. 178

Chapter 9 Demographic Analysis of the Study Sample.............................. 179

Career Patterns.............................. 181

The Contribution of Race and Age to the Salary of Scholars....... 183

Family Background.............................. 188

Comparison of Black and of White Scholars.............................. 190

Chapter 10 Career Patterns by Age and by Race.............................. 212

Chapter 11 Black Graduates of Predominantly Black and Predominantly White Colleges: A Comparative Analysis.............................. 236

Age of Scholar and Undergraduate School.............................. 240

Employment Category, Teaching Rank, and Salary.................. 242

Salary and Rank by Racial Category of School of Employment....... 250

Rank of Colleges that Recruit Black Scholars.................... 256

Chapter | Page

Chapter 12 Similarities and Differences between the Outstanding Black Scholars and the National Sample........................ 272

Ascribed Characteristics.. 272

Acquired Characteristics.. 273

Family Background Characteristics.............................. 275

References.. 280

Appendix.. 288

PART I

THEORIES, METHODS, DATA

The Components of Achievement and Definitions of Outstanding Professional Status

The components of achievement and success in minority and majority populations -- What are they? A comparative analysis is needed. For too long social scientists have used one group as a norm and assumed that behavior in that group was representative of all: with reference to race, whites have been used as the norm; with reference to sex, males have been used as the norm; with reference to socioeconomic status, the affluent have been used as the norm. This precisely is what Christopther Jencks and his colleagues did in their book entitled Inequality (1972). Commenting upon this practice, Howard Taylor said that the inferences about the contribution, if any, of education to achievement is based on a sophisticated statistical technique called path analysis; however, "not one single path analysis in the entire report [on Inequality] is performed on even one black sample." Yet, Taylor said, Jencks "clearly infers that education is not related to success for black people"; and he uses his study as the basis for this inference (Taylor, 1977:243-250). Such an inference should not be made when blacks have not been the subject of investigation.

With an orientation ~~that was~~ similar to ~~the one exhibited by~~ that of Jencks, Daniel Patrick Moynihan concluded that the progress of blacks as a group is seriously retarded because of their alleged matriarchal family structure, which, he said, is "so out of line with the rest of American society" (1965:29). Clearly, the implication is that black family forms that are different from white family forms should be changed if blacks wish to participate in the opportunities that whites experience in this society.

The practice of projecting the behavior patterns that characterize one group upon another group is ~~bad~~ invalid social science. It ~~and~~ has impaired our understanding of varying adaptations among cultural groups to the situations and circumstances surrounding them. Moreover, the practice of assuming that the way of life of the dominant people of power is the norm to which others should conform has blinded us to the cultural innovations among the subdominants that may be of unique benefit to them because of their situation. Perhaps these cultural innovations of minorities ~~could~~ be modified to the advantage of dominant populations, even as some practices of the dominants have benefited all.

This study will analyze achievement patterns as they are manifested in majority and minority populations. Special emphasis will be given to the adaptations of minorities largely because their achievement behavior has been ignored and neglected. "Most of the previous work," according to Jerold Heiss, "focuses on the black family not for its intrinsic interest, but rather because it is thought to be implicated in a social problem" (Heiss, 1975:4). We approach the study of the relative achievement of black and white scholars as an analysis of cultural patterns rather than as an investigation of social problems. OUr approach rejects the assumption that it is "a disadvantage for a minority group to be operating on one principle, while the great majority of the population, and the one with the most advantages to begin with, is operating on another (Moynihan, 1965:29). We assume that dominant and subdominant populations exist in a system where each group may have different patterns from the other but where neither pattern is assumed to be inferior.

Occupation and Social Mobility

The United States is a wage earning society. Two-thirds of the national income is derived from wages and salaries (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1980). Over the years, there has been a slight upgrading of the occupational structure due to shrinkage in such categories as self-employed manager, laborers, and farm occupations (Hauser and Featherman, 1977). The increases have come at the levels of salaried professionals, managers, and skilled ~~and kindred~~ workers. However, the shift over the years from lower-status to higher-status occupations has been modest.

In the light of these facts, Hauser and Featherman concluded that "if recent expectations of mobility between generations are to be met in the future, there will have to be a continuous expansion of opportunities for employment in higher-status occupations" (1977:90, 96).

Louis Kriesberg also called attention to the function of an expanding economy upon employment and income opportunities. He said that generational change in the proportion of the population which is poor is largely determined by economic developments and public policies regarding income maintenance and distribution" (Kriesberg, 1968:5-6).

During the 1970's a debate emerged between social scientists regarding the effect, if any, of changing opportunities in the economy for blacks. Richard Freeman said that "the economic status of college-educated black workers improved greatly in the 1960's and early 1970's." Indeed, he said that "the economic position of all black male graduates...improved, though not by enough to obtain equality in income or employment possibilities with whites." Freeman attributes this increase to governmental efforts to end discrimination and increased educational opportunities for young black men at the college level. He said that the opportunities had not spread throughout the labor market because it is not a "structureless bourse in which persons of different ages are interchangeable." He reminded us that " all young college graduates were more (negatively) affected by the market downturn than experienced personnel, and that young black men were more (positively) affected by the decline in market discrimination than their elders." Freeman declared that "income discrimination has been eliminated from new entrants" but that "the legacy of past discrimination is likely to maintain a sizeable black-white gap amoung college men as a whole for years to come" (1976a:137-157).

~~Otis Dudley~~ Duncan and Hodge's studies have shown that upward mobility in terms of occupation is a reality for some individuals in the labor force, including blacks. They also found some downward mobility, particularly among those whose fathers' jobs were of high socioeconomic status (1963:629-644). It is possible that gains during the late 1960's and the 1970's ~~could~~ be wiped out by an unstable or constricting economy, the repeal of affirmative action legislation, or the absence of diligent enforcement of such laws that guarantee equity and equal opportunity in employment by race. Certainly the progeny of blacks who have experienced new employment opportunities may not have similar experiences if there is reduction in affirmative action. As Duncan ~~has~~ found, downward mobility is an ever-present possibility.

At the conclusion of his chapter on "The 'New Labor Market' for Black Graduates," Freeman tempered the enthusiasm of his report on the elimination of the historic disadvantage of educated black women and young black male graduates by this statement: "parity in starting jobs does not guarantee parity in promotion in the future." In other words, "market discrimination could simply have a more delayed reaction on the economic status of black graduates than in the past." Acknowledging one of the sources of the "new labor market" for educated blacks, Freeman concluded that "if governmental pressures for affirmative action weakens, so too will demand for black college personnel"

(1976a:146). Our study will enable us to determine whether this is a general or a limited finding, a temporary or a permanent trend; and whether gains at the entry level have been sustained by promotions and equitable salary increases. If the "unprecedented job opportunities in the corporate and government sectors" that "more talented and highly educated blacks are experiencing" is due to "the expansion of salaried white-collar positions and the pressure of demonstrated affirmative action" as William Wilson claims (1978:121), then the trends that have been observed may not continue in a constricting economy, especially in the area of employment in education where blacks have made great strides, or during a period when the executive branch of the federal government may downgrade affirmative action in its hierarchy of priorities.

Parents and Offspring: Intergenerational Effects

With reference to parental background, Duncan, report~~s~~ that the association between occupation of parent and occupation of offspring is modest. At the most, 10 percent was the estimated amount of occupational inheritance experienced by men in ~~his~~ their study (1963:635). The association is so modest, that Beverly Duncan and Otis Duncan said, it is safer to conclude that "socioeconomic origins have little bearings on occupational success given a man's job qualifications" (1970:166, 156-177).

Examining young black males, Freeman arrived at a conclusion that was similar to that of the Duncans; he found that "in the younger male actual occupational calculations, parental occupation has a positive though not significant effect' (Freeman, 1976^{b}:103).

A modest association between intergenerational occupational mobility and job of the father is stronger among whites than among blacks, according to Larry Hunt and Janet Hunt (1977:114). This fact is further evidence that a finding pertaining to one racial group should not be projected upon another. Moreover, it refutes the theme in the literature that "racial stratification...is perpetuated by...race differences in the father-son connection." Such a theme was articulated by Freeman, who said that "discrimination aside, most black Americans are disadvantaged by coming from families of low socio-economic status..." (Freeman, 1976^{b}:87). This assertion was made despite Freeman's contrary finding regarding the insignificance of intergenerational occupational effects already mentioned and his other finding that young black men from the poorest backgrounds progressed in the new labor market of the late 1960's and early 1970's (Freeman, 1976^{b}.217).

If occupational mobility in the United States has been facilitated largely by an increase in the number of higher-status jobs available, education of the individual rather than the occupation of his parent appears to make a greater contribution to one's opportunity to get one of these jobs. Beverly Duncan and Otis Duncan said that "schooling is found to be the most important determinant of occupational success. School has...a consistent positive effect on occupational success"

(1970:162). Schooling is a way of qualifying one for a job, especially a professional, managerial, or skilled-crafts job~~s~~.

Richard Coleman and Lee Rainwater analyzed the responses of population samples in Boston and Kansas to this question: "What do you think is the most effective way for a person to improve his social standing in America?" "A better education" was a prominent response, along with hard work, ambition, and encouragement by parents. "The important thing about the ingredient of a better education," reported the researchers, "is the occupational opportunities it opens to the aspirant for upward mobility. In the case of the highest-paying professionals, where entry absolutely depends on acquisition of the proper credentials of schooling, it can even be a crucial ingredient." The people put it this way: "First, get an education -- that will get you a better job and that will lead to higher social standing, because you will then be making more money" (1978:239). Colemen and Rainwater stated that most of the people recognized, however, that "education's role is only as an entry ticket to the contest for higher status and no guarantee of winning" (1978:240).

Even among blacks where a family background variable such as occupation of parents seemed to be unrelated to the current population in the labor force, education was important and had an intergenerational effect. Freeman found "the relationship between family background and educational and labor market achievement, traditionally quite weak among black Americans, was greatly strengthened for young persons in the new market to approach that found among whites" (Freeman, 1976b:216). Considering the impact of parental background on the probability that young blacks would be employed in elite professional and managerial occupations, Freeman reported a moderate .20 effect (in terms of the estimated beta parameter). Among young blacks, he found that the coefficient of parental education was greater than the coefficient of parental occupation (Freeman, 1976b:103).

Education and Social Mobility

Actually, education contributes to upward mobility ~~more~~ by its direct effect upon the individual who receives it. Intervening effects such as the education of parents diminish in significance compared with the association of formal schooling and occupational mobility attained by an individual.

In the past, racial discrimination has been a significant barrier against upward mobility of blacks, even blacks with an education. In the 1960's, for example, Beverly Duncan and Otis Duncan found that the occupational score of a black man "will average only one scale point higher than his father's occupation score although he will have had three more years of formal schooling than his father; a white man's score will average some ten scale points higher although he too will have had only three additional years of formal schooling." This finding means that when one controls for education and family structure, "the black man cannot expect to transmit to his son such occupational status as he has been able to achieve with an effectiveness approaching the white standard"

(1970:169). Toward the end of the 1970s decade, William Wilson calimed that "the equal employment legislation in the early sixties ~~have~~ has virtually eliminated the tendency of employers to create a split labor market in which black labor is deemed cheaper than white labor regardless of work performed..." (1978:110). Dorothy Newman and her associates are unready to embrace this sweeping conclusion on the basis of these facts: "Blacks had achieved 94 percent of whites' educational position by 1974 and 1975, compared with 70 percent in 1940. But whatever the years, blacks' occupational position did not match their educational position" (1978:49). Contrary to the finding of Freeman and Wilson about educated young blacks, Newman siad that even "the young and most highly educated...did not escape differences in hiring and promotion" (1978:49). U.S. Census Bureau (1980:255) data reveal that in 1967, among 18- to 24-year-olds, the proportion of whites enrolled in college was twice that of blacks (26.9 percent for whites and 13.0 percent for blacks). By 1978, the white/black differential had been narrowed to 5.6 percent (25.7 for whites and 20.1 for blacks). The Gallup Poll of the Public Attitudes Toward the Public Schools published in 1978 revealed 46 percent of minorities compared to 35 percent of majority members who responded believed that a college education is very important (Phi Delta Kappa, ~~Inc.~~, 1978). Blacks appear~~s~~ to be using education as their upward mobility means.

At the graduate level, the proportion of majority and minority group members 25 years of age and over with graduate schooling of five or more years was small -- 6.8 percent and 3.1 percent, respectively. The rate of catchup among minorities, however, exceeded the rate of forward progress among members of the majority. Fifteen years ago white enrollment in graduate school exceeded that of blacks by a factor of 2.6; the gap was reduced during a decade and one-half to an excess factor for whites of 2.3. In terms of group-specific progress, in 1978 there were two and one-half times more minorities 25 years of age and over who had engaged in post-graduate study than in 1967, the year before Martin Luther King, Jr. died; among whites, there were only one and eight-tenths times more individuals of a similar age who had engaged in post-graduate education during the same time period (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980:296-297).

Israel Tribble, Jr. said that blacks do not pay any attention to those who attempt to downgrade the value of a college education. He said that in no way has the faltering and painfully slow steps with which the United States has traveled toward some semblance of educational opportunity for blacks diminished the perceived value of education in their eyes. He said that "education has been a direct and proven path to upward mobility and leadership in the black community and that blacks know that "a college education has practical as well as symbolic significance" (1979:422, 426 (421-427)). Indeed, economist Clifton Wharton, Jr. said, "in recent years, the investment to develop the black community has paid off far more for blacks than for whites." Wharton said that recently "the relative increases for black men in average income were twice as large as those for white men" despite the fact that deplorable "income differentials remain between blacks and whites of comparable educational level" (1972:281-282).

The name of Martin Luther King, Jr. was invoked ~~above~~ to explain the new gains in education by blacks because his death had a profound effect on the educational establishment in ~~America~~ the United States. This opinion was expressed by Charles Odegaard, former president of the University of Washington. In a Macy Foundation-sponsored report on Minorities in Medicine, ~~he~~ [illegible] said, "The assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in April 1968, spurred liberally oriented administrators and faculty in medical schools to greater action to recruit and admit minorities" (1977:22). These figures compiled by Odegaard represent an astounding increase; from 783 blacks in first-year classes in American medical schools in 1968-69, the number increased to 1,042 the next year and steadily climbed each year thereafter up through 1975-76 (the last year included in the Macy Foundation study) to a high of 3,456. In other words, the proportion of black admitted to first-year classes for graduate study in medicine jumped from 2.2 percent of all entering students, the academic year of King's death, to 6.2 percent seven years later. The rise was dramatic and steep the three years immediately after King died: from a one-third increase in 1969-70, the number almost doubled in 1970-71, and achieved a level in 1971-72 that was more than two and one-half times greater than the black enrollment in 1968-69 (Odegaard, 1977:31).

The death of a famous black American would seem to be a great sacrifice and an inappropriate price for the purpose of gaining increased occupational opportunities through increased opportunities for graduate study. Because of the small numbers who have received post-graduate education in medicine and other professional fields, or even a college education, the~~ir~~ impact upon the income of black people as a population parameter necessarily is small. However, ~~they~~ represent an important beginning in the achievement of racial equity. Thus, blacks have identified higher education as an important path to liberation.

Definitions of Outstanding Professional Status

The accomplishments of five outstanding black scholars in the humanities and social sciences will be analyzed in detail in Part II. Here, we present the definitions of outstanding professional ~~scholarly~~ status as given by a national sample of black and of white scholars in the fields of economics, history, literature, political science, and psychology. How the sample was obtained will be explained fully in chapter 2; only a brief description is rendered now.

Of the 554 individuals in our nationwide sample of humanists and social scientists, 407 responded to our request to rank several scholars in their field who had been nominated as outstanding. Table 1-2 presents a distribution by race of reasons for ranking a scholar: ~~by race;~~ 55 percent of the reasons were offered by white respondents, 37 percent by black respondents and 8 percent by respondents classified as other minorities. ~~All outstanding scholars were black, as the study was focused specifically on excellence in this racial population.~~ Some respondents ranked the nominated scholars but did not give reasons for their choices; others gave several reasons for ranking a scholar as outstanding. All told, two-thirds of the respondents ranked the scholars and gave reasons they used to make their decisions.

A substantial proportion of all respondents listed scholarship as the main reason for classifying one as outstanding. This category referred to research, writing, and publications. Each of the eight other reasons was subscribed to by less than one-tenth of all respondents.

Blacks and whites agreed that scholarship was the main indicator of outstanding professional status in the humanities and social sciences. In addition to scholarship, the other criteria used by all (in order of significance as determined by frequency of response) were professional association activity, public service, professional reputation, competence (including intelligence and creativity), teaching, commitment to the black community, institutional affiliation, and integrity (including honesty and objectivity). Some of these have to do with personal attributes and others with organizational participation.

The distributions of the reasons for ranking an individual as outstanding were analyzed by race. Kendall's tau was computed and revealed an association between the ranked distributions for blacks and whites that resulted in a coefficient of .47. This coefficient was evidence of the presence of a positive correlation between the ranking system employed by the two racial populations; it also indicated the existence of some differences between the two racial populations in definitions of outstanding professional status, in that the correlation was not perfect.

At the top and bottom of the distributions, there was agreement between blacks and whites, as stated earlier, that research, writing, and publishing (generically called scholarship) are important components of ~~scholarly excellence,~~ of outstanding professional status and also that integrity is important enough to be listed but least important in the nine-item hierarchy. After scholarship, blacks listed competence, public service, professional association activity, and commitment to the black community as most important in their hierarchy of criteria of outstanding professional status; these were in the top half of their hierarchy. Whites also identified scholarship as the main criterion and then listed professional association activity, professional reputation, and public service as the other criteria in the top half of their hierarchy. ~~With the exception of three indicators~~ Black and white scholars disagreed on the relative importance of competence, professional reputation and commitment to the black community; but they ~~blacks and whites~~ agreed with only minor differences on the ~~most~~ significance and rank of ~~important~~ indicators ~~of outstanding professional status in the humanities and the social sciences. They were~~ scholarship, professional association activity, and public service. ~~Modest differences appeared in the relative weight that the racial populations gave to these indicators in the middle range of the hierarchy.~~

One could argue that the two categories, competence and professional reputation, are different indicators of the same phenomenon. Blacks prefer to assess intelligence and creativity directly as a personal attribute which they call competence. Whites prefer to assess these ~~intelligence and creativity~~ indirectly as a ~~they are~~ reflection of ~~in one's~~ reputation. If we assume that competence and professional reputation are merely two different indicators of intelligence and creativity, then the major difference between the races in their hierarchy of criteria is the inclusion of commitment to the black community in the top half of the hierarchy ~~of criteria~~ by blacks and the exclusion of this item in the top half of the hierarchy by whites. One might be inclined to classify the concern by blacks about commitment to the black community as self-serving. If this is true, one can understand why whites left such an item out of the top half of their hierarchy of indicators.

A more philosophical issue may be involved regarding what should and should not be included in a hierarchy of indicators of outstanding professional status. Observers of human nature and of social relations with different perspectives such as Neal Peirce, the journalist, Eric Hoffer, the longshoreman and writer, and Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, the economists, have arrived at similar conclusions about the function of subdominant populations in the power structure for the total society. Peirce said, "A society deserves to be judged on how it treats its least fortunate members" (Peirce, 1981:14). In more colorful language, Hoffer called the subdominant people of power "the dregs" who, as they rise to the top, manifest the innermost worth of a nation (Hoffer, 1963:148). Bowles and Gintis set forth this principle: "The humanity of a nation, it is said, can be gauged by the character of its prisons" (Bowles and Gintis, 1976:102). All of this suggests that a concern about subdominant populations may be a universal requirement of anyone who aspires to be outstanding.

According to the hierarchy of values expressed by blacks in our study, one cannot be callous about oppression, indifferent or uncommitted to the people who experience it, and be an outstanding scholar in the humanities and the social sciences. Along with the criteria of research, writing, publishing, intelligence, creativity, public service, and professional association activity, blacks have added an ethical requirement of concern for the poor, oppressed, and afflicted For ~~by~~ those who would be called outstanding. It could be that the minority group in our study has identified an indicator of outstanding professional status that should be included as an important indicator by all groups. According to this analysis, professional achievement ~~worthy of being classified as outstanding~~ must be concerned with the enhancement of others as well as the advancement of oneself.

There is cause for celebration that consensus exists between the racial populations regarding scholarship, professional association activity, and public service as important criteria of outstanding professional status. It is regretable that teaching is ranked by all in the bottom half or the nine-item hierarchy. Also there is cause for concern and even consternation that black scholars and white scholars share the belief that integrity is of least importance among the criteria listed as an indicator of outstanding professional status.

Table 1-1

Criteria of Outstanding Professional Status for Black Scholars in the Humanities and Social Sciences Reported by a National Sample of Professional Association Members, by Race

Criteria	Percent				Rank				Ratio of Total Percent to Race Percent		
	Total N = 405	Black N = 152	White N = 222	Other N = 31	Total	Black	White	Other	Black	White	Other
Scholarship	46.4	51.3	42.3	51.6	1	1	1	1	1.10	.91	1.11
Professional Association Activity	7.6	7.2	7.7	10.0	2	4.5	2.5	3	.95	1.01	1.32
Public Service	6.9	7.9	5.4	12.9	3	3	4	2	1.14	.78	1.87
Professional Reputation	6.2	4.6	7.7	3.2	4	6	2.5	5.5	.74	1.24	.52
Competence	5.2	8.5	2.7	6.4	5	2	5.5	4	1.63	.52	1.23
Teaching	3.0	3.9	2.7	-	6.5	7	5.5	-	1.30	.90	-
Commitment to Black Community	3.0	7.2	.4	-	6.5	4.5	8.5	-	2.40	.13	-
Institutional Affiliation	1.7	2.0	1.8	-	8	8	7	-	1.18	1.06	-
Integrity	.7	.7	.4	3.2	9	9	8.5	5.5	1.00	.57	4.57

1-20 20

Chapter 2

Life-History and Survey-Analysis Methods of Investigation

In his book Exploraticns in Social Theory, William Goode states that "for nearly half a century, sociologists have paid little attention to historical data" (1973:25). An increasing number of papers that are published in sociology journals "utilize data from one time point only" (1973:25). Yet more and more historical studies are stimulated by sociological theory in that some now deal with ordinary social behavior, the main data of sociologists. Many sociologists seem to be unaware of this fact (1973:25). The social historians who try to account for and understand patterns of collective behavior acknowledge that "the concepts and procedures employed commonly come from adjacent social sciences" (Landes and Tilly, 1971:72).

Social historians, for example, are beginning to focus on what some have called collective history. This type of history analyzes among other concerns the biographies of political elites, patterns of social mobility, and major events in the past such as epidemics by examining systematically accumulated records of inviduals (Landes and Tilly, 1971:71-72). A salient characteristic of social history "is its extensive reliance on comparison ... -- the systematic, standardized analysis of similar social processes or phenomena ... in different settings in order to develop and test general ideas of how those processes or phenomena work" (Landes and Tilly, 1971:73). The leaders of the discipline admit that comparative history "has received a powerful impetus from the growing attention of historians to the generalizations of social and behavioral science"; they conclude that "history has as much to give to the other social sciences as they have to give to history" (Landes and Tilly, 1971:73, 72).

The perspective of historians is beneficial in sociological analysis such as that undertaken in this study because many scholars in that field may be dually classified as humanists and social scientists. The humanists insist that human experience is best understood within the matrix of time and place. They believe that to extract human experience from its matrix is "an insult to the integrity of the historical process" (Landes and Tilly, 1971:10).

The purpose of this study is to determine the matrix ~~aspects~~ of the lives of specific scholars and how it has ~~[illegible]~~ contributed to their success. The scholars selected for study are blacks who work in the United States. Blacks are identified as the universe of study because of the paucity of our knowledge about their career patterns.

The methods of history and sociology are used in this investigation. A combination of general biographic facts and data derived from interviews about the family, educational, and career life-histories of five outstanding black scholars ~~was~~ were obtained. This information was assembled for individuals who were ranked as outstanding by a random sample of minority and of majority persons in their professional associations. Survey research methods were used to identify the ranking scholars in economics, political science, psychology, history, and English. The social sciences and humanities were appropriate fields to study. Toward the end of the 1970 decade, most blacks obtained doctoral degrees in education, the social sciences, and the humanities, and in that order (New York Times, April 20, 1980:Educ 25).

Survey

Officers and members of the governing boards of each of the major professional associations as well as the most prominant black professional associations were asked to nominate the three most outstanding black scholars in their respective fields. In some cases it was not possible to obtain the membership lists of the governing boards of the black professional organizations, so committees representing blacks within the major professional associations, or editorial boards of journals dealing with black aspects of the fields, were surveyed. Thus, in addition to obtaining nominations from leaders in the American Economics Association, the American Historical Association, the American Philosophical Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Political Science Association, and the Modern Language Association, nominations were also obtained from leaders in the National Association of Black Economists, the editorial board of the Negro Journal of Black History, the Committee on the Status of Blacks in Philosophy, the editorial board of the Journal of Black Psychology, the National Conference of Black Political Scientists, and the College Language Association.

The nominations from these sources were then tallied and the scholars mentioned most frequently were listed as the panel of outstanding black scholars. In most cases it was possible to select the top three scholars in a field, but in some fields, several scholars were tied for third place. In cases where there were ties, those tied were all listed as nominees.

The nominees had been selected by leaders in each field, but in order to obtain a broader representation of opinion concerning scholarly excellence, a sample of members of each field was asked to rank the nominees. Obtaining responses from members of the majority race as well as from members of minority groups was a goal of the study. Therefore, the memberships of both the major national professional organization in each field and the national black professional organization in each field were sampled.

A random sample of members listed in the major national professional associations was selected. Two hundred names of nonstudent members of each major professional association were systematically drawn from the membership directories of each of the associations. The membership list of the College Language Association was obtained and all members in the field of English were surveyed. The entire membership of the National Association of Black Economists was also surveyed.

In the instance of history, where the membership list of the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History was kept confidential, an arrangement was made with the custodian of the membership list to mail out the questionnaire from his headquarters. In political science, the membership list of the black organization was not available, nor did the president agree to mail out the questionnaires. Philosophy had no list of black members or separate black group. For these three fields, catalogues of 118 predominantly black colleges and universities were obtained and questionnaires were sent to a sample of faculty members in each field. Faculty members at these schools are not always black, but this method was used in an attempt to increase the black response rates in these fields.

In all, a total of 1,200 members of the major professional organizations, 865 members of the black organizations, and the faculties of 118 predominantly black colleges and universities were sent ranking forms and questionnaires. The respondents were asked to rank the black scholars who had been nominated. They were also given the option of naming an excellent black scholar of their own choice who had not been nominated Respondents were also asked to explain their reasons for their selections.

In addition to ranking excellent black scholars in their fields, respondents were asked to fill out a brief questionnaire that included educational and occupational data as well as data concerning age, race, sex, and family background. The purpose of the questionnaire was to carry out a comparison between whites and blacks within each of the fields concerning educational and occupational mobility and success.

Of the 2,065 questionnaires sent out in two waves, 554 useable instruments were returned as seen in Table 2-1. This is a respectable return rate in race-relations research because the level of suspicion and hostility is high, and many in both majority and minority populations are reluctant to participate in surveys.

The analysis of those who refused to participate is presented to indicate issues that ought to be considered in planning future investigations. Some, of course, refused to participate in the study and simply failed to acknowledge receipt of our letter. The race of these nonrespondents is unknown since they failed to answer the questionnaire.

Several nonrespondents claimed that the study was a waste of public resources, was not relevant to them particularly, or used a questionable data-gathering methodology. Regarding the use of study findings, a few informants questioned what would be done with the data. In other words, they wanted to know what policy implications could be drawn from the data, who would draw these implications, and how these implications would be applied in the development of public policy. Specifically, one respondent wrote, "without further information regarding the source of this study, the potential uses and whether the above named are cooperating with this research, I feel unwilling to fill out this form."

A few nonrespondents felt that the study was racist and that scholarly excellence is the same for all racial groups. One respondent wrote, "the idea of this survey goes against the grain - it seems to permit the worst kind of racial stereotyping and I deeply regret that."

One statement on the letter that generated negative comments was that the life history of the ranking scholar would be useful as a role model. Individuals questioned whether the study could identify the "best" role model and the need for such an approach. One respondent stated, "I don't agree that your proposed life-history will be of obvious value; why should it be of any more value than role-models such as Curie, Galileo, or Archimedes?"

A few respondents and nonrespondents alike objected to the absence of women on the nomination list of outstanding scholars. In clarifying this concern, one respondent wrote, "I would also, as a woman, find it disheartening if you would give no consideration to providing a profile of women." Another wrote, "no book on Black scholars should be written without the inclusion of Black women. Blacks cannot afford to be either 'sexist' or 'racist.'" (It should be noted that the list of nominees was derived from knowledgeable scholars in each field and could not be controlled by the research staff.) These intense feelings about the absence of women, despite the fact that the researchers were not responsible for the outcome of the nomination process, indicates how much women resent being overlooked and unrecognized for their professional contributions.

Ten individuals wrote about objections to the study that may be characterized as methodological. These included concern about the absence of objective criteria of scholarly excellence, and dissatisfaction with the nominating and ranking procedures for determing outstanding black scholars.

Participants in the study were asked to rank the individuals if they knew of their work even if they did not know them personally; respondents were asked to rank such persons in terms of their own standards of scholarly excellence. Different individuals consider different contributions of a professional to be more or less significant in a particular field. By permitting each respondent to weight the characteristics that he or she considered more important, we were able to derive a range of definitions of excellence. Some respondents would have preferred that characteristics of scholarly excellence had been specified so that they could rank the scholars nominated according to the predetermined characteristics. This was not the approach used in this study.

Extraordinary efforts are needed to generate trust so that the public will participate in studies like this one. In this respect, race-relations research differs from other behavioral-science investigations. One way of accommodating the unique requirements of studies involving blacks, whites, and other racial and ethnic groups is to diversify the research team so that proper respect for racial and ethnic sensitivities is shown in the study rationale, the research design, the research instruments, and the analysis and interpretation of the findings. Another approach is to provide sufficient resources to facilitate face-to-face interaction when possible in the collection of data. These and other approaches may be useful in the process of nurturing trust and cooperation.

Case Study

Initially, we planned to interview six outstanding scholars but reduced the number to five. Philosophy was retained in the survey analysis of black and white scholars but eliminated from the case study because too few blacks were in the field to do a valid reputational analysis of the most outstanding scholar; most professionals in this field did not know the nominees well enough to rank them. One of the authors interviewed each of the outstanding scholars to obtain information about current household as well as family of orientation and other relevant experiences. Paul Lazarsfeld stated that contemporary information should be supplemented by information on earlier phases of whatever is being studied (quoted in Landes and Tilly, 1971:72-73). The interviews provided information about the past that contributed to our understanding of the current circumstances of the scholars.

Specifically, the scholars were asked questions about family background and economic circumstances, community race-relations climate, parents' philosophy of education, experiences in school, college, and graduate education, and career development. The case studies were prepared and submitted to each of the scholars for comments.

A goal of this study was to gain an understanding of the significant events and their interconnections in the life histories of our scholars and in the process of social interaction between them and others in the society. In effect, the five scholars served as our ideal types.

Classification of social facts is a perennial problem in social science research. Max Weber suggested that the description of types of social phenomena could be a starting point. According to G. Duncan

Mitchell, the analyst who uses this method of analysis seeks to determine the extent to which individuals and their social practices conform to or deviate from that of the ideal (Mitchell, 1968:87-89). With no operational definition of ideal black scholarship, we decided to develop one inductively by analyzing the life histories of people identified by others in their field as outstanding. This is why we call the five outstanding black scholars ideal types. They are models of success in professional achievement and career development.

These scholars nominated by black, brown, and white professionals are marginal people who are known within and beyond their groups. We identify marginal people as those with experience in majority and minority cultures who may rise above the two groups in which they participate as well as fall between them. Everett Stonequist said that "the marginal [person] is the key personality in the contact of cultures. It is in his [or her] mind that the cultures come together, conflict, and eventually work out some kind of mutual adjustment and interpenetration." Stonequist concluded that "the life-histories of marginal [people] offer the most significant material for the analysis of the cultural process as it springs from the contact of social groups" (Stonequist, 1937:222). With this perspective, the life histories of five scholars are studied.

The case method is a useful way of studying social organization as Samuel Stouffer, the methodologist, proved in his doctoral dissertation submitted to the University of Chicago decades ago. He advocated use of the case method not only because it can obtain results that are similar to those obtained in quantitative studies, but also because it "suggest[s] connecting links in processes which may elude the statistician" (Stouffer, 1980).

We were particularly interested in our scholars' odyssey with education from childhood through adulthood, although we focused on the college years and graduate school. We studied career from initial professional appointment to current work. We obtained the scholars' interpretations of the meaning of various events in their unfolding careers. We obtained information on how each scholar decided to go into his chosen field, his area or areas of specialization, and impediments if any faced in career development.

The life history of each scholar, according to Floyd Allport, is a structure of ongoing events. The life history of each scholar as a structure of ongoing events is "self-limiting" and "unified." The "whole" is different from the separate "parts"; yet the whole is pervasive throughout all the parts so that a system can relate through events that which is "inside" to that which is "outside" and can link that which comes "before" to that which comes "after," and that which is "below" to that which is "above" (Allport, 1955:615-619).

Using the event-structure theoretical framework of Allport, we attempted to discover critical events in the life histories of the five scholars. We examined the stages in the life-cycle, significant events that separated or linked these stages or ongoing processes. For example, we identified the age at which one entered college, number of years of matriculation before graduation, age when graduate study began, the length of time between the commencement and the end of graduate study, and professional employment before and after receipt of terminal degree. We determined the length of affiliation that a scholar had with various employers, including events of promotion or demotion, and the assumption of new and different roles and responsibilities. We examined the quantity and quality of professional publications, the age at which publishing began, the rate of publishing, and the receipt of professional honors and other recognitions.

Data on events of a personal nature were obtained too. They included information on age at marriage, date of marriage in relation to college graduation and graduate study, length of marriage, number of offspring, and age at birth of offspring.

By examining the structure of events in the ongoing education and career processes of each scholar, we were able to identify events between stages that served as barriers or inducements to movement. Moreover, we were able to determine similarities, if any, in the pattern of structured events in the lives of our ideal-type scholars.

Our approach was similar to one employed in the medical educational pathway analysis. That study, concerned with efforts to achieve equal representation of minority students in medicine, identified the interrelated events in becoming a physician, such as becoming a qualified medical school applicant, becoming a medical school student, becoming a medical school graduate, becoming a licensed physician, and becoming a practicing physician. Linkages between processes were examined to determine, what the researchers called, "action elements" that encourage exit from the educational pathway or contributed to student retention (Health Resources Administration, 1977:22-46).

The organization of information by ongoing processes (or stages or seasons) that are separated by significant events appeared to be a helpful way of studying the life histories of our scholars. Daniel Levinson and his collaborators discovered that "each phase in the life cycle has its own virtues and limitations. To realize its potential value, we must know and accept its terms and create our lives within it accordingly" (Levinson, 1978:x). If we can identify what is done in various stages of the education and career-development process and how it is done, our research may be of value to young scholars who are building a career.

To determine similarities and differences among the five scholars, we constructed a table that symbolically represented a family-education-career tree. The age at which the five scholars did or did not accomplish some things are the limbs of the tree that sprout at various periods above the base. We consolidated the data for the separate scholars into a composite portrait of family, education, and career development.

These data gave a time and space perspective on family, education, and career development and the relationship between these ongoing processes and significant events. This approach, like the one used by Lewis Terman and Melita Oden in their logitudinal study of gifted people, enables us to determine not only what scholars do with gifts in mental ability, but how and when they use their gifts (1960:823-833).

Table 2-1 The Sample by Academic Area of Responding Individuals

	Black		White		Total
	N	%	N	%	N
Philosophy	7	12.9	47	87.0	54
Political Science	12	19.0	51	81.0	63
History	21	28.0	54	72.0	75
Economics	32	41.5	47	59.5	79
Psychology	48	46.2	56	53.8	104
Totals	179	35.6	324	64.4	503*

*Of the 554 respondents, 44 were of racial and ethnic groups other than U.S. white or U.S. black; data were missing for 7.

34

Part II

Life Histories

Chapter 3

Career, Education, and Family Stages

The goal of this study was to discover the stages of development of outstanding black scholars and to assess the factors that led to their achievements.

In education, William Boyd found that blacks in predominantly white colleges are frequently insulted by the inference that they are "special admit" students. "The main stereotype," he reported, "is that blacks are so different and deficient that increased equal opportunity in higher education can occur only if colleges lower their academic standards" (Boyd, 1974:4). And, of course, women of achievement often are victims of insinuations that they made it to the top by providing sexual favors for their male supervisors. This study will shed light on the truth or falsity of several racial stereotypes.

In our study, we discovered five scholars who were praised by their professional colleagues: John Hope Franklin, W. Arthur Lewis, Kenneth B. Clark, Matthew Holden, Jr., and Darwin T. Turner.

[redacted]

Let us turn our attention to the life processes and the events that developed our five candidates into the scholars that they are. Manfred Stanley states that organism is one of two master metaphors of Western civilization; the other is mechanism (Stanley, 1979:137). These two have been used often to organize data for scientific analysis. Allport describes social organisms as self-limiting, unified, dynamic structures or systems that are ongoing through events that both link and separate the processes and relate that which is inside the system to that which is outside (Allport, 1955:615-619).

As stated in an earlier chapter, we shall use the event-structure theoretical framework of Allport to help us discover critical events in the life histories of the scholars. Particularly, we will be interested in identifying stages in their career development process and the presence, if any, of consistent patterns among the five scholars. This analysis may suggest the formulation of an ideal type construction applicable to other scholars in the social sciences and humanities. If such a construction can be formulated, it should be accepted as tentative until verified by further research on a range of populations.

That this study population is a racial minority group does not necessarily rule it out as representative of other population groups. Robert Merton stated that "not infrequently ... the ... minority in a society represents the interests and ultimate values of the group more effectively than the ... majority" (Merton, 1968:421). Richard Wright said that American whites can understand themselves better as the majority by looking at the coming to know and understand the minority. Poetically, he said, speaking for all blacks to whites, "*We* are *you* looking back at you from the dark mirror of our lives" (Wright and Rosskam, 1941:145-146).

The Levinson Tradition

In some respects, our research is in the tradition of Daniel J. Levinson and is a further test of his theories presented in *The Seasons of a Man's Life* (Levinson, 1978). Unlike Erikson who regards development as a series of stages in ego development, our analysis is closer to the concept of life structure formulated by Levinson and his collaborators. This concept "is centered more directly on the boundary between self and the world. It gives equal consideration to self and world as aspects of the lived life" (Levinson, 1978:323).

Our approach differs from Levinson in that we consider career development as a sequence of structured events or a system that interacts with, but conceptually is different from, the family or kinship system, and the education system. While Levinson consolidates these, analyzing the sequence of periods in development, we prefer to disaggregate the systems and analyze career, family, and education separately and only then as one interdependent system. The difference mentioned is more stylistic than substantive, having to do with technique of analysis.

If there is a fundamental difference in our approach and that of Levinson, it is at the level of assumption. We do not assume that the various periods in adult development are in "a fixed sequence," that the various periods must be "traversed ... in the order given," and that one can not skip a period (Levinson, 1978:319). We accept the concept of life-structure development in stages as a useful metaphor that aids in ordering our analysis of the career of scholars; but we do not wish to reify the metaphor. Indeed, we had difficulty initially with the concept of stage development and almost rejected it as a redaction.

Freedom is an eternal possibility in human social relations. Choice and purpose are of the essence. Habit and custom often becloud these facts and make them difficult to comprehend. But they exist nevertheless, whether or not one acknowledges freedom, choice, and purpose in human circumstances. Thus an analytic concept that violated these basic assumptions would be of limited value in explaining social aspects of human development such as career, education, and family development. In effect, Levinson acknowledges our assumption about freedom when he said, "the developmental periods are age-linked but they are not a simple derivative of age" (Levinson, 1978:319).

We found the concept of stage development of value, however, because it tends to be sequential and appears to be fixed. Thus, we embrace Levinson's description of how the sequence works:

> During the current period, a man works chiefly on the developmental tasks of this period. But he also does some work on the tasks of other periods. Tasks that will become primary in later periods may be activated early. The tasks of preceding periods are not completed and cast aside when those periods come to an end. If they are worked out reasonably well at the appropriate time, they continue to support further development in subsequent periods. Gains of the past form the ground on which current developmental efforts are built (Levinson, 1978:321).

Our Assumptions and Approach

This description we accept as an appropriate description of the developmental process, if it is recognized that one goes through a series of tasks that appear to be beyond choice or control, not so much because they are, but because the tasks ~~choice and freedom to act or not to act~~ are shared ~~by way of purpose that is desired~~ in common with others.

One is not fully in control of what happens in the unfolding of a career through numerous stages. One may affirm oneself; but confirmation must come from others. Others are free to give or withhold confirmation even as one is free to affirm or not to affirm one's self-interest. Most of us in human society eventually learn that our affirmed self-interest is accommodated favorably and confirmed by others only if we respond from time to time in ways that confirm and fulfill their self-interest. Reciprocity and mutuality indicate that none is fully in control of his or her fate.

While one moves through the states of development almost inexorably from one level to another, one tends to do this because of habit on the one hand and custom on the other, and not because the stages are fixed or movement is inflexible. They merely appear to be fixed and inflexible.

A concept of the stages of development that acknowledges freedom, choice, and purpose in human social relations accepts the possibility of change in sequences of development, including skipping ahead and falling behind. Because deviations from the conventional involve mutual decisions by the initiator of action and those who must respond, and because the initiator of action can never completely control the responses of others, deviations usually are implemented at the risk of disapproval because of discomfort due to disruption of customary ways of doing things. Most people, not wishing to experience disapproval, behave in habitual and customary ways.

[redacted]

Our goal was to discover habitual and customary ways in which successful scholars in American society have developed. Specifically we wanted to know how outstanding black scholars achieved eminence in a society where they are members of a minority population. We were cognizant of Levinson's profound statement that "we need great wisdom lest we evaluate too superficially" (Levinson, 1978:320).

We pondered case studies of the life histories of each of the five scholars to discover clues to their development. Information was obtained from analysis of personal interviews, curriculum vitae, biographical sketches in *Who's Who in America*, *American Men and Women of Science*, *Social Science Citation Index*, *Who's Who in Black America*, and books and articles written by the scholars.

Each scholar was given a copy of the narrative reconstruction of his life-history so that errors could be corrected and faulty interpretations clarified.

We should mention for the record that while this analysis of the stages in a scholar's life is concerned with blacks and is limited to men, we are aware of the benefits of comparative analysis, and believe that similar studies of whites and of women would be of value. The reason for limiting this phase of our study to blacks has been discussed earlier. It would have been fruitful to analyze black women scholars if they had emerged from our rating process. Some women were nominated, but none was voted the most outstanding in her field. Considering the way a sexist society has distributed opportunities for professional advancement in the past, it would be appropriate to deliberately undertake a study of stages in the development of career, education, and family life of minority and majority women even as this case study — though not fully anticipated or planned to be this kind — is a study of oustanding black men.

Levinson said that one of the greatest surprises was the relatively low variability in the age at which every period begins and ends: "this finding violates the long-held and cherished idea that individual adults develop at very different paces ... when we look at development in terms of the evolution of life structure, the periods follow an age-linked sequence" (Levinson, 1978:318).

[redacted]

Because our goal is to develop an ideal type model, we shall report only the average for the five scholars in Table 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3. However, the variations of individuals around averages will be discussed.

For each scholar, the age at the beginning of a stage, critical events that contributed to the end or beginning of a [redacted] stage, and the length of each stage in one's career was analyzed separately and then consolidated.

Career Stages

We discovered that these ideal-type scholars in the humanities and social sciences had careers that separated into four stages. Stage I begins around 24 years of age and usually consists of such scholarly activity as teaching, research, and writing. It extends from 6 to 7 years. Stage II begins around 30 or 31 years of age and lasts 8 to 9 years. It consists largely of teaching, research, writing and public service. Stage III is a period for refining the teaching, research, and writing skills developed in the first two stages, expanding one's participation in public affairs, and possibly developing administrative skills. Stage III begins around the age of 39 years and extends over a period of 10 to 11 years. Stage IV begins at the mid-century point in a scholar's life, around one's fifty-first year. In this stage, all skills developed during the previous periods are consolidated into a complementary pattern, and administrative skills may be further developed. Responsibility for the leadership of learned societies is assumed. Stage IV may extend from 15 to 19 years depending on age of retirement.

In summary, each stage refines the skills developed in previous stages and initiates new skills. Moreover, the length of time that one spends in a stage gradually increases as one passes through higher stages from 6 to 7 years in the first, 8 to 9 in the second, 11 to 12 years in the third, and 15 to 19 in the fourth. As one works out one's career from stage to succeeding stage, one assumes new responsibilities in each new stage and therefore is given more time than one had in the previous stage to assimilate new responsibility with previous obligations.

Levinson's statement about the absence of variability in age around the beginning and ending of a stage in part is confirmed and in part is contradicted by the findings of our analysis. In each of the four stages, a majority of the five scholars are within one to four years of the age of the other scholars at the beginning of a period. This is a more or less narrow range of variability.

Yet the total variability by age is as great as 10 years for all five scholars in stage I and II, and eight years in stages III and IV. When one considers that the lengths of stages I and II are six to seven years, and eight to nine years, respectively, a variability of 10 years is great.

Often one and usually not more than two scholars account for the wide variability. For example, in stage I four of the scholars were within a 5-year age range but one deviated from the top of the 5-year range by 10 years. Stage IV had been reached by only 3 of the 5 scholars. Only a 1-year difference separated the ages at which 2 of the scholars reached this stage. One scholar, however, was 7 years above the age of the youngest scholar.

Not only did we observe 1 and sometimes 2 scholars deviating widely from the norm with reference to age of entry into a stage, at least 1 of the 5 scholars took twice as long to finish a stage as the scholar who most rapidly passed through the stage. It is because of this finding that we question the rigid and fixed age pattern that some would impose upon the stages of adult development. While most individuals enter and complete a stage within the normative period prescribed, one person here and there will not conform to that pattern.

It is the person who violates the norm that interests us. He or she tells us much about the flexibility of the human condition. We wish to know whether a person who lages behind, remains behind. Likewise, does a person who lurches ahead stay ahead? The answer to both questions is negative. Some scholars spend too little time maturing in one stage and make up what they missed in the next. Thus they spend more time than usual in the next stage doing the regular tasks and making up missed opportunities of the past. Other scholars prematurely take on responsibilities in one stage that are more appropriate for the next stage. Thus, their time in the lower stage may be prolonged so that the usual tasks of that stage can be performed along with added responsibilities.

Tasks in stages I and II are commonly traded back and forth by scholars. Of our 5 scholars, 2 waited as late as stage III, which normally occurs between 40 and 50 years of age, to make up for scholarly activities that should have been performed earlier. Stage III is about the last opportunity one has to make up deficiencies if one wishes to bring one's career to a successful conclusion as an oustanding scholar during the 15 to 19 years of Stage IV. The two scholars who waited until stage III to catch up were extraordinarily productive of scholarly works between 40 and 50 years of age. They caught up and demonstrated that the adult life structure is flexible and responsive to compensatory action. However, the individual pays a price when professional activity that should have been spread over several years is concentrated into a shorter period. Thus, the stages for scholarly development and their age ranges are normative by prevailing habit and custom. But individuals may tailor their adaptation to the various stages, with consequences of course if the adaptations vary from the expected.

Nevertheless, variations are possible.

As a final point regarding variability in age at which one enters a career stage and length of time required to complete it, our analysis reveals that one who enters a stage at the youngest age does not necessarily complete the stage in the shortest period of time. Also, one who is the oldest upon entering a stage does not necessarily remain in that stage longer than others. Leveinson is correct in his statement that "the life cycle is an organic whole" and that "the past and future are in the present" (Levinson, 1978:321). While the past, present, and future condition each other, human experience usually provides for compensatory action. The present is never fixed as long as there is freedom, choice, and purpose. It can be modified to accommodate the past and to anticipate the future. Such a modification in the light of the past and the future can occur in any developmental stage. In the social and psychological systems nothing is forever fixed and unchangeable.

Other Research

Our findings regarding compensatory action as a fundamental part of the social system, including the career-development process of scholars in the humanities and social sciences, is corroborated by other research such as the studies on creativity by Harvey Lehman (Lehman, 1946:460-480; 1947:342-356), and the study of early-maturing and late-maturing boys by Mary Cover Jones (Jones, 1960:804-822).

Lehman reported that "the renowned benefactors of humanity ... were less than 25 years old at the time they did their most creative work." His statement applied to 56 percent of the chemists, 53 percent of the mathematicians, 53 percent of distinguished authors, and 30 percent of eminent philosophers (Lehman, 1946:478-479). This finding also means that more than 40 percent of the scientists and humanists made renowned contributions to their fields after the age of 25 years. The reciprocal figure is frequently forgotten. For example, Lehman found that about 12 percent of psychologists, 8 percent of economists and political scientists, and 4 percent of writers published creative works after the age of 60 years (Lehman, 1946:355). This is further evidence that catchup time is possible in the psychological and social systems. It may be experienced by only a few. But the few prove the rule that the stages of adult development are not rigid, fixed, and unaccommodating to varying temporal patterns of individual adaptation.

Lehman discovered one individual in his studies of creative output who made his "first and notable chemistry contribution as late as age 75." On the basis of this finding, Lehman said, "it seems logical to infer that, although there is no deadline beyond which it is impossible to make one's intial contribution, age 75 is too old to start contributing if one hopes to make more than one important contribution" (Lehman, 1946:466). This essentially is one of the consequences or prices of delaying and deferring tasks to a later stage that could and should be dealt with in an earlier stage: one's total scholarly output is likely to be reduced (Lehman, 1946: 470).

Further evidence that catchup time is possible is provided by Jones' study of the adult careers of early-maturing and late-maturing boys. Jones said that it is well known that "early- or late-maturing may have a considerable bearing upon the social life and personal adjustment of some individuals during ... adolescence." But what of the long-term effects? Jones found the early-maturing teenagers showed marked differences in size, strength, and attractiveness of physique. The early-maturing boys also were judged to be more relaxed than the late-maturing adolescents. By the age of 33 years, she found that differences in size of the two groups had diminished to insignificance. Each group showed considerable overlap in manifestation of masculine characteristics. The two groups were similar in socioeconomic status and in level of education obtained.

As stated before, there are consequences for starting ahead or lagging behind. The consequences may be positive or negative. One consequence for the late-maturing adolescents that manifested itself during adulthood was a more flexible attitude. Jones speculates that "in the course of having to adapt to difficult status problems, the late-maturers gained some insights and are indeed more flexible while the early-maturing, capitalizing on their ability to make a good impression, may have clung to their earlier success pattern ... becoming somewhat rigid" (Jones, 1960:812, 805-814).

Our finding that those who start out ahead do not always stay ahead is corroborated by the findings not only of Jones but also of Terman and Oden (Terman and Oden, 1947:194), who studied 781 individuals who were among the top 1 percent of intelligent people in the United States, according to standardized tests. The mean age at high-school graduation was at least a year below the average for others in their state; moreover, of those respondents whose education had ended before the follow-up study, 90 percent of the men and 86 percent of the women entered college. However, approximately 30 percent did not graduate from college. About 20 percent of the sample had not begun to fulfill their potential, according to these researchers. Clearly the ability was present, but other things interfered.

In addition to identifying the stages of scholarly development, we now analyze the ideal type scholar's career contribution to the field of education and to the literature of his discipline. We begin with an analysis of one's service in the field of education because it is the principal institutional context for the career of most scholars in the humanities and social sciences.

The average scholar in our study, as seen in Table 3-2, has been in education about a third of a century, which is 90 percent of his professional career, and has been affiliated with about 4 different colleges or universities, for an average term of 8 years at each school. Actually, the pattern of service involves fewer years on the faculty of the first schools of employment and more years at the most recent schools of employment.

The longest service our scholars had rendered a single school averaged 18 years. This figure represented exceptional continuity; however, it is heavily weighted by one scholar whose entire career was spent at one institution. Discounting the effect of his experience, the average still is at 13 years, indicating a remarkable amount of institutional loyalty.

There is debate about whether administration and scholarship are compatible or incompatible. Our scholars are not of one mind on this matter. It would appear, however, based on their experience, that administration is a component in educational leadership in the careers of those who are outstanding, and must be accommodated at some stage in one's career, usually in stages III and IV. Our scholars devoted 10 to 11 years to administration as departmental chairman, dean, or president of an educational institution and as administrators in governmental and private consulting agencies. This average is weighted by one scholar who devoted twice as much time to administration as any of the others. When his experience is discounted, the administrative commitment remains at about 7 to 8 years, approximately one-fourth of the average time our scholars worked in the field of education. Thus, one may expect the ideal type scholar to spend from one-fourth to one-third of his or her career in administration. This may come as a surprise to some but probably is what is in the wind for those who lead the field.

The publishing experience of our scholars is extensive. These men began publishing early in their career and published steadily over the years. Lehman said, "our most distinguished creative thinkers have usually possessed, among other things, an astonishing capacity for hard patient work" (Lehman, 1946:474). The productivity of our scholars represents such work. They have authored or edited an average of 11 to 12 books, and published an average of 52 to 53 articles in learned journals. They began publishing at a relatively early age. Their first articles were published when they were 26 to 27 years of age, only 2 to 3 years after the commencement of their professional careers. An average of about 6 years after the first article appeared, many of our scholars produced a book. At this point in their careers, they were an average of 32 to 33 years old, 8 to 9 years on the job, and solidly in the second stage of career development. The life span of creativity of the 5 scholars in terms of number of years between first and current article averaged a quarter of a century.

The most creative work is not always completed at an early age. Lehman found this pattern: "the major contributors to a given field accomplished their first important research at younger average ages and their last important work at older average ages" (Lehman, 1946:467). The younger starters, however, tend to exhibit greater productivity (Lehman, 1946:474).

"On the whole ... those destined to go far have started early and moved rapidly" (Lehman, 1946:479). Shakespeare and Dickens are examples of this principle. Their first contributions were published at the age of 24 and 21 years, respectively. Shakespeare's publishing career extended over a range of 25 years and Dickens' over a range of 36 years (Lehman, 1946:471). These individuals were not unlike our scholars -- Franklin and Lewis, for example. Franklin's first article was published when he was 23 years of age, and Lewis' first article when he was 24. Both have continued to publish steadily for more than 40 years.

In summary, the publishing pattern of the ideal type scholar begins with a contribution of articles to learned journals early in the first stage of one's career, when one is 26 to 27 years of age, and then continues, maybe with a book, a half-dozen years later after one has entered the second stage of one's career. Thereafter, one probably will publish an article every two years and eventually author or edit about a dozen books during the course of a productive career that may extend over at least a quarter of a century.

Educational Stages

As mentioned earlier, we analyze educational development as a process that is both related to and separate from the structured events of a career. We have identified four educational stages -- I and II: preschool and the primary and secondary grades; III: college; IV: graduate education. In analyzing these stages, we will identify the age of our scholars when they enter and exit. Then we will examine education and its relationship to career development and family structure.

As seen in Table 3-2, all our scholars completed secondary school on time and probably ahead of time in terms of the age at which they graduated.

None was over 16 years old; two were even younger. Our scholars completed educational stages I and II with dispatch and moved immediately into college.

According to our analysis, the ideal type scholar commences adulthood with college degree in hand. The average age upon graduation for our ideal type scholars was 20. Our scholars fulfilled the requirements of college and stage III before they were called upon to assume other adult responsibilities. Straightaway, they enrolled for the master's degree, all except one, who matriculated immediately for the doctorate.

Our scholars earned a Master of Arts or a Master of Science degree in 1 to 2 years and graduated at the average age of 21 or 22 years. The master's is the first-level degree of stage IV, graduate education, which ends when one has achieved a doctoral degree. All except 1 scholar immediately enrolled for a doctorate after receiving a master's degree. There was continuity in their formal education. Five to 6 years later, our scholars had doctoral degrees. The ideal type scholar completes formal education when one is 26 or 27 years old.

The ideal type scholar moves immediately from one stage of educational development to the next. Within a stage, however, one may hop, skip, and jump, as most of our scholars did in elementary or secondary school in stage II, and as one of our scholars did in graduate school in stage IV.

Three scholars took time out before studying for the doctoral degree. This is the first respite that any of the scholars permitted himself during the course of his odyssey with education. None let up before receiving the master's degree. After that, time out was called for not more than three years; in most instances, this time was less. The interlude was used largely to replenish depleted finances.

Probably more important than the young age of the scholars is the short period they required to obtain a Ph.D. degree. They were in, through, and out of graduate school before other concerns could distract them.

That our scholars had limited finances is indicated by the fact that most of them had to begin their careers before they received the doctoral degree, although they received it at an early age. To support themselves while finishing their studies, they signed on as teachers in colleges and universities -- some part time and others full time. These jobs launched the careers of our scholars in education. This was the experience of most of our scholars, who entered their profession when they were 23 to 24 years old, a few years before their doctorates were awarded. Our scholars have remained as members of the teaching profession, which they entered in early adulthood. All except one is affiliated with the academy.

The necessity to work may have been an asset providing a precept-and-example experience of what the life of scholarship is about, a reinforcement of an earlier vocational choice. Thus the ideal type scholar may serve more or less as an apprentice 3 to 4 years before fully credentialed. When it comes too early, full-time work may interfere with fulfillment of student requirements. When it comes a year or two before the end of student status, it both enhances the ending of formal education and helps the beginning of a professional career.

Family Stages

And what of the kinship system? How is it related to the other two? The kinship system exists in three stages -- I: the family of orientation in which the offspring receives nurturance, support, protection, and unconditional love; II: the independent householder, an experimental period in transition without the responsibility and obligation of unconditional love and commitment; III: the family of procreation in which the parent gives nurturance, support, protection, and unconditional love.

The roles and responsibilities in the kinship system are evidence that stage development is neither rigid nor fixed. Indeed the survival of the kinship system depends on freedom, choice, and purpose, certainly not on inflexible qualities. Yet the family is often stereotyped in form and function. It, more than any other social system, is influenced by habit and custom, which accounts for its highly regularized ways.

As seen in Table 3-3, the ideal type scholar is nurtured, supported, and protected in a family of orientation from birth to the age of 21 or 22 years. It would appear that two full decades of nurturance, support, and unconditional love are necessary to prepare one for a scholarly career of independent inquiry, creative synthesis, and conceptual analysis.

As mentioned before, compensatory action is an ever-present possibility in social and psychological activity. A two-person household is the conventional way of caring for offspring in a family. But our scholars have grown and prospered in a number of alternative arrangements that fully functioned as a family and that fulfilled all responsibilities and commitment to the offspring. Our scholars came of age in nuclear families, extended families, blended families, one-parent families. Despite the household composition, adult members were nurturing, supportive, and loving. Our ideal type scholars are a reflection of such care.

More important than the household composition is the temporal period of support that an offspring received. A withdrawal of support prematurely could have stunted the educational development of our scholars. And a stunted education would have interfered with professional opportunities in their chosen vocation. The premature withdrawal of support could have severe repercussions.

In our study, all 5 scholars received direct and full family support from preschool and primary and secondary school through college. They remained as official household members of their families of orientation while moving through these levels in their educational development. Three scholars remained in the family of orientation until they obtained the master's degree. With this material, social, and emotional family support, our scholars moved rapidly through their education without much interruption.

The transitional period is stage II, when one leaves the household of one's parents. This ranged from 2 to 10 years for four of our scholars. One scholar skipped this period altogether and immediately formed a family of procreation as he left the household of his family of orientation. One is free to change customary ways of doing things. But there are consequences, as we have mentioned, with which one must abide.

Our scholars needed these variable transitional years. Each had to experiment with different things. One had to earn sufficient funds and then go back to school. Another was involved in establishing himself in a new physical and spiritual environment. Still another had sufficient scholarship money if supplemented with menial work but no support for dissertation research. The transitional independent householder years were 6 to 7 years for four of our scholars. None married before 24 years; two waited until their thirties.

The transitional stage gets its name from the kinship system. But it is related to education and work. Before marriage, 2 scholars obtained their doctoral degrees, 4 had acquired their master's; all had the baccaulaureate degree well in hand an average of 6 to 7 years before they married. Graduate study came during the period of transition in family status. It appears that marriage is postponed during the transitional years to accommodate higher education for our ideal type scholar who aspires to achieve the highest academic degree.

At the end of the transitional period, 3 things happened suddenly. Three scholars received professional appointments while single and before they received the Ph.D. Two worked two years and one worked four years; then they all married. Only 1 scholar married without a permanent appointment.

In summary, the sequence of action is interesting among our scholars, whose first priority was higher education, including graduate study. The second priority was starting a career, and the third priority was marriage. None married before the bachelor's degree; all were still single when they received the master's degree. Three married before the doctor's degree, although 2 married after receiving it. Most of these changes occurred during stage II, the age of transition that began at age 21 or 22 years and extended to 28 or 29. After then, stage III in the family took over.

Among our scholars, stage III has been a long-lasting experience. It is the period when the family of procreation nurtures and cares for its offspring while the scholar is developing a professional career. Formal study for education is behind one. Marriage and an oustanding career as a scholar seem to go hand in hand, so far as our ideal type scholar is concerned. They appear to stabilize each other. Our scholars with magnificent careers married when they were 26 to 27 years old, 2 to 3 years after their careers had begun. They have been married an average of 33 years. They have been outstanding and productive scholars. Their households consist of an average of two children.

Conclusion

This analysis indicates that career, education, and family development processes are relatively independent in that each process has a life-range of its own and a sequence of stages that are system-specific. The analysis also reveals that these structures or systems are interrelated, that events in one system condition happenings in another.

It was particularly interesting to analyze the convergence of events in all three systems during the transitional stage of independent householder in the kinship system. Within a short period of time, scholars started their professional careers, married, and ended their formal education. Not by chance did these happenings occur almost simultaneously in each of the three systems. One may conclude that these are covariant events, each influenced by happenings outside its own system.

As a source of power, the career system is unchallenged. It certainly was primary in the public identity of our five scholars and their households. Because of their careers, our scholars received multiple honors for their creative professional contributions.

A career as a scholar, however, is greatly assisted by formal education. Higher education at the graduate-school level is necessary — although it may not be sufficient — for attainment of the status of a scholar. The credentialing function of formal education gives it an authoritative position in our society. Education has less power to grant the privileges and prerogatives that a successful career in scholarship can convey. But its authority is overwhelming as a sanctioning agency for academic standards. As such, it is the midwife for most professional careers, including a career in scholarship. Education, then, is our second most powerful system.

Least power is the kinship system, and yet this system is the most enduring. It is the structure through which young people receive nurturance, support, and protection, and through which adults give nurturance, support, and protection. The family system is fragile and family members are vulnerable. They are sustained by unconditional love, which all may give but which any can withhold and cannot be compelled to cooperate. When it occurs, such action threatens the stability of the family structure.

Despite its weak and vulnerable structure, the family remains essential in educational and career development. It can orient one toward or away from extended formal schooling. It can stabilize or disrupt a professional career. The family of orientation is concerned with the former; the family of procreation, with the latter. None who would be scholars in our study married until he had achieved a master's degree, obtained in most instances with full family support. The outstanding scholars in our study had decades of marriage behind them to spouses who were supportive, to spouses whom they loved and who loved them.

Without support of families, achievement in education and careers is very difficult. Neither system is able to stand alone and on its own.

Table 3-1

Stages in a Scholar's Career
(Combined Experiences of Franklin, Lewis, Clark, Holden, Turner)

1981

Characteristics of Career		Average Age, Year, and Number
Stage I	Teaching, Research, Writing	
	Beginning age	23.8
	Length in years	6.6
Stage II	Teaching, Research, Writing, Public Service	
	Beginning age	30.4
	Length in years	8.8
Stage III	Teaching, Research, Writing, Public Service, Administration	
	Beginning age	39.2
	Length in years	11.4
Stage IV	Teaching, Research, Writing, Public Service, Administration, Leader of Learned Societies	
	Beginning age	51
	Length in years in progress	15.3
Other Career Characteristics		
	Number of years in education	32.8
	Number of years in administration	10.4
	Number of different colleges of employment	4
	Years of longest service to a single school	18.4
	Number of articles published	52.5
	Number of books authored or edited	11.6
	Age at publication of first article	26.6
	Age at publication of first book	32.6
	Age at publication of most recent article	58.6
	Age at publication of most recent book	55.2
	Years between publication of first and most recent article	32
	Years between publication of first and most recent book	23.6
	Age of presidency of leading U.S. professional association	60

Table 3-2

Stages in the Education of a Scholar's Career
(Combined Experiences of Franklin, Lewis, Clark, Holden, Turner)

1981

Educational Characteristics	Average Age, Year, and Number
Stages I and II Preschool, Elementary and Secondary School	
Ending age	15
Length in years	15
Stage III College	
Ending age	20
Length in years	5
Stage IV Graduate Education	
Ending age	26.4
Length in years (from bachelor's to doctor's)	6.4
Length in years (from bachelor's to master's)	1.8
Length in years (from master's to doctor's)	5.5
Relationship between Education and Career	
Age at beginning of stage I in career	23.8
Length in years (from end of college to beginning of career)	3.8
Length in years (that career began before Ph.D. study ended)	3.8
Length in years (that career began after Ph.D. study ended)	2
Relationship between Education and Family	
Age at marriage	26.2
Length in years (from end of college to beginning of marriage)	6.5
Length in years (marriage began before Ph.D. study ended)	3.3
Length in years (marriage began after Ph.D. study ended)	4.5

Table 3-3

Stages in the Family of a Scholar's Career
(Combined Experiences of Franklin, Lewis, Clark, Holden, Turner)

1981

Family Characteristics		Average Age, Year, and Number
Stage I	Family of Orientation (Offspring Receiving)	
	Ending age	21.2
	Length in years	21.2
Stage II	Independent Householder (Offspring in Own Home)	
	Ending age	28.3
	Length in years	6.3
[illegible]age III	Family of Procreation (Parent Giving)	
	Length of years in progress	33.4
Other Family Characteristics		
	Age at initial marriage	26.2
	Number of marriages	1.2
	Number of children in household	2.2
Relationship between the Family and Career		
	Age at beginning of career	23.8
	Length in years (of marriage before career began)	4
	Length in years (of marriage after career began)	4

Chapter 4

JOHN HOPE FRANKLIN

THE HISTORIAN WHO UNDERSTANDS

In his important study, The Seasons of a Man's Life, psychologist Daniel J. Levinson reviews the story of Faust and describes his quest for knowledge as the hubris of the scientist (Levinson, 1978:249). Philosopher Huston Smith, author of Forgotten Truth, goes one step further and classifies our hunt for knowledge of humanity as "the final exploitation" because of the built-in violence that reduces the object of knowledge to object (Smith, 1976:126). These consequences of knowledge-getting in the humanities and social sciences -- self-serving glorification or destructive reductionism -- can be prevented only if while getting knowledge one also seeks understanding. This precisely is what John Hope Franklin, the historian, has done.

In the history that Franklin writes knowledge and understanding are complementary: one without the other is incomplete. Out of the mouth of John Hope Franklin comes both knowledge and understanding. His contribution has been that of making history a wisdom field devoid of the cult of fictitious glorification of a whole society or the cant of quantitative reductionism that analyzes parts out of context.

By any measure John Hope Franklin, for more than a decade the John Matthews Manly Distinguished Service Professor at the University of Chicago (Emeritus in 1982), is one of the most celebrated historians in the United States. His book, From Slavery to Freedom, is in its fifth edition and has been described as the best history of black Americans. Thrice honored by professional peers, he has been elected president of three of the most prestigious historical organizations in the United States.

How a black person born in Rentiesville, Oklahoma, a relatively poor all-black town of approximately 2,000 souls (to which Franklin's family moved as a temoprary protection against the outrage of discrimination) could achieve so much, so well, and not exhibit the slightest trace of arrogance is close to a miracle. How he has managed to remain unpretentious with his colleagues, accessible to his students, kind in his criticism, and generous in his praise are significant aspects of the John Hope Franklin saga, and are as important as his scholarly achievements.

Influence on the Field of History and Recognition by Peers

In the process of being truly generous to persons near and dear to him, Franklin has managed not only to write good history but also to make history through the development of his wide-ranging career as teacher, researcher, administrator, and policy-maker. The listing of his works cited by other scholars in 1975 and 1976, for example, demonstrates his extensive influence on contemporary scholarship. The Social Science Citation Index reported that at least 15 different books and articles by Franklin were cited in approximately 50 social-science journals during this two-year period. His works were cited by scholars in a number of different disciplines. To illustrate, he was cited in Social Work, Journal of Negro Education, Social Problems, Journal of Politics, American Sociological Review, to name a few, and in several history journals. The most frequently cited reference was his basic text, From Slavery to Freedom; about one-third of all references had to do with material from that book, of which more than 500,000 copies have been sold.

Franklin has continued to do good research and function as a productive scholar. A more recent book he authored, Southern Odyssey, won the Jules Landry Award from the Louisiana State University Press for the best manuscript submitted in 1975 in history, biography, or literature. Between 1943 and 1981, he authored or edited 17 books, an average of about one book every two years.

Franklin is recognized by his peers of all races and in all regions as an excellent historian, the most outstanding black historian. This conclusion is based on our survey. Selected white scholars and black scholars associated with advisory boards and governing councils of national professional and scholarly organizations in the field of history were each asked to nominate at least three outstanding black scholars. John Hope Franklin was most frequently nominated by individuals in all racial populations. The names of the four scholars with multiple nominations were submitted as a panel to a national random sample of 109 professional historians, both black and white; they were asked to rank the panel of four in terms of their own criteria of scholarly excellence and to submit additional names if none in the panel met their criteria. Only one name was added by one of the 109 in the national sample. Ten returned the survey instrument and stated that they did not wish to participate in the study. Of the 99 professional historians who ranked the panel of five (which included four nominees and one added by a rater), 66 gave John Hope Franklin a first-place vote as the outstanding black scholar in history.

Scholarship

When one considers his achievements, clearly Franklin's reputation transcends racial boundaries. John Hope Franklin is a real scholar; and the real, as stated by Huston Smith, always has a transcendent character (Smith, 1976:142). "I have said I was a mainstreamer," Franklin reports. "Even in my graduate work, I refused to get put over in a corner and made a stereotype." Before selecting his dissertation topic on the free Negro in North Carolina, Franklin went through several metamorphoses at Harvard. While matriculated as a graduate student, he published a paper on "Edward Bellamy and the Nationalist Movement" (Franklin, 1938). He considered doing research on Christian Socialism and almost decided to specialize in British history but pulled back from each of these topics for various reasons, and finally followed through with research on free Negroes, a project he had begun as an undergraduate student with his history teacher at Fisk University. Despite his focus on the South and on blacks, in his own opinion his investigations have been concerned with "the mainstream." Franklin told Jack Star, who was preparing an article for Change magazine, "I don't teach black history at the University of Chicago. I teach the history of the South -- black and white" (Star, 1977:28). And his focus on the South [redacted] is an effort to understand the condition of our total society.

The transcendent character of Franklin's scholarship is revealed in his analytical approach of "maintaining a discreet balance" and giving "proper consideration for anonymous as well as outstanding people" (Franklin, 1977:xiv).

An Honest Assessment of the South

As a referee of the past, Franklin classifies events as they are and not as he or others would prefer that they be. When his book The Militant South was being considered for publication by the Harvard University Press, one critique that it received from a southern white historian questioned whether the manuscript should be published. Then the southerner allowed that it might be all right to publish if a view of the South by a Negro was what the press wanted (Star, 1977:30). This evaluation is an illustration of the destructiveness of reductionism. By emphasizing the race of the historian, Franklin's skills in scholarly research were denied. Franklin believes that "there are more valid standards by which to judge a people than race" (Franklin, 1960:17). Fortunately, the Harvard University Press took a similar view and published the book.

Franklin's service as president of the Southern Historical Association was particularly significant in the light of his criticism of some southern scholarship. In 1960, a decade and a year before heading the Southern Historical Association, Franklin stated that "nowhere in the United States ... has the cult of history flourished as it has flourished in the South" (Franklin, 1960:17). For such candor, he has been both criticized and praised.

Nevertheless, Franklin said what had to be said because he knew that "history has been an important instrument in shaping human affairs" (Franklin, 1960:17). He believed that a distorted historical tradition could be corrected, and that a correct history could help change a churlish and short-sighted reaction to ongoing events in the South. Thus, Franklin's honest assessments were for the purpose of helping the South and ultimately the nation. The South, according to Franklin, "has been continuously both southern and American" (Franklin, 1960:18).

Family Background

How did Franklin become the person that he is? Presented here is the family background that bent the twig, so to speak. "I come from a professional family," he said. "I am not a first-generation college graduate." Franklin's father from the Indian Territory, attended Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia, the Roger Williams College (now defunct) in Nashville, Tennessee, and read law at the Kent College of Law. The first black president of Morehouse College was John Hope. John Hope Franklin was named in honor of this educator.

Franklin's mother and father met at the Roger Williams College, where she completed the normal school course of study for teachers. The family settled in Oklahoma and his father passed the state bar, finishing second among all who took the examination. The family first lived in Ardmore, Oklahoma, then in Rentiesville, an all-black town, and finally in Tulsa. While Franklin's father practiced law, his mother taught elementary school between the events of giving birth to four offspring. John Hope Franklin was the youngest.

An incident of discrimination in the court infuriated Franklin's father and caused him to move the family to the all-black town of Rentiesville to protect them against such insults as he had experienced. Actually the incident occurred not in Oklahoma but in Louisiana. There, his father had gone to represent a client but was told by the judge in Shreveport, "no nigger is going to represent any client in my court." His father was then ordered either to sit down or get out.

In addition to practicing law in Rentiesville, where a sister and John Hope were born, his father was the postmaster and the justice of the peace. But the town of only 2,000 or so people was too small to support a viable law practice.

John Hope Franklin remained in Rentiesville until the age of 10 years. When he was growing up, there was no day care for the children of working parents. Consequently, his mother took him to the school in which she taught, sat him on the back bench in her classes, and told him to be quiet. "I learned to read by sitting in on her classes." His mother did not know at that time that he, a preschooler, was learning to read like the school-age children. But she was pleased when she discovered that he could read. Franklin said that his mother had high expectations for him and for all of her children. The Franklin offspring all finished high school and college.

Meanwhile, Franklin's father decided to risk the outside world again and went to Tulsa when John Hope was only 6 years old to establish a full-time law practice. He went alone and came home from time to time to visit his wife and children. He surmised that by the end of the current school year his wife could stop working and the whole family could move to the city. But bad luck struck again. Six months after Franklin's father had opened a law office in Tulsa, the 1921 race riot in that city wiped out everything; his father's office was burned to the ground. His father did not recover from his losses until 1925. Then the family moved to Tulsa and his mother retired from teaching. Franklin, the youngest child, was 10 years old.

Franklin was pleased to be in the presence of his father again, regularly. Despite the bad experiences in Louisiana and initially in Tulsa, Franklin said that his father ignored segregation whenever he could. Franklin remembers going to court with his father as a child and sitting at the lawyer's table. "I learned to be an integrationist from my father."

Tulsa proved to be a more viable setting for the practice of law. But the financial reverses associated with the 1921 riot strained household funds. The family could muster the costs for college, but postgraduate education payments were beyond its means.

Education

High School

Franklin described his high-school years in Tulsa as normal. They occurred during the age of segregation, when blacks and whites by law were assigned to different schools. His teachers were good: "They gave me a sense of self-confidence." He also learned to type and take shorthand in high school, skills that helped finance college and graduate school. The class valedictorian, Franklin graduated from high school in Tulsa at the age of 16 years.

College

Franklin left Oklahoma and journeyed to Nashville, Tennessee, to enroll in Fisk University. His parents knew that Nashville was an educational center because they had studied there earlier. His brother had gone to Fisk. Always ready to measure up to any challenge, Franklin said, "I figured I could do anything my brother could do. So I went to Fisk, intending to be a lawyer."

Franklin's career plans changed abruptly during his sophomore year. His own description of the conversation is interesting: "At Fisk, I met a young professor, a young white professor, born in Amesbury, Massachusetts. He was a historian and specialized in Latin American history. This young professor was named Theodore S. Currier. He was a person with great charm and became my mentor. I took a course with Theodore Currier. He discovered that I had it and he nurtured me to attend Harvard. Currier taught American history to me my second year in college. I had never had such an intellectual experience."

In subsequent years after taking more history courses, Franklin said, he then knew what a historian was and that he wanted to be a historian. He enjoys trying to understand the present by looking at the past, "putting things together with small clues." Other experiences at Fisk were helpful. Franklin was secretary to the librarian. He said that the education and support he received in college were so effective that he was not awed by graduate school.

Graduating from Fisk, magna cum laude, at the age of 20 years, Franklin applied to and was accepted for graduate study by Harvard University. When Franklin had reached his senior college year, Currier advised him to go to Harvard to study history. But the year was 1935, one of the middle years of the Depression. Despite his aspirations, Franklin understood his family's financial situation. "My father's law business had been crushed by the Depression, so the family could not finance my graduate study." Returning home the summer after graduating from college, Franklin wondered what he would do.

When Currier heard of Franklin's problems, he said, "Money will not keep you from going to Harvard!" He asked if Franklin could make it to Nashville; there the two would try to find a solution. There was no source they could tap for funds. So Currier, a young professor only 33 years of age who joined the Fisk faculty in 1929, went to the bank and borrowed enough money to pay for Franklin's first year at Harvard.

Currier helped John Hope Franklin and many more students like him. Several outstanding blacks such as the historian L. D. Reddick, who prepared a biography of Martin Luther King, Jr. and a history of the Montgomery bus boycott; and the lawyer Wade McCree, former Solicitor General of the United States, were taught by Currier and graduated from

Fisk. It was, in part, through Currier's efforts that a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa was established at Fisk, into which John Hope Franklin was inducted as a founding member. Currier remained on the Fisk faculty more than 40 years. He died in 1979.

Franklin is the executor of Currier's estate. He and his wife are setting up a scholarship at Fisk in Currier's honor. The Franklins are contributing to it and they will turn over the proceeds from the sale of Currier's estate to the fund. "We hope it will become the largest scholarship fund at Fisk." Hearing Franklin reminisce about his relationship with Currier, one can understand why he would like to perpetuate the name of his mentor: "Currier was my closest friend. We started out in a student-teacher relationship but became very close friends. He had a 40-acre place in Maine that I visited often during the summer months." Franklin will always remember Currier's decisive statement: "Money will not keep you from going to Harvard!"

Graduate School

Franklin studied first for the Master of Arts degree in history at Harvard and earned it in one year. He financed the first stage of graduate education with the bank loan that Currier made, small contributions from his father, and by working as dishwasher and typist.

After teaching a year at Fisk, Franklin returned to Harvard in 1937 for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in history, which he received in 1941 at the age of 26 years, just six years beyond college graduation. This is a remarkably short period in view of the fact that his studies were twice interrupted by full-time teaching assignments -- first at Fisk for one year, then at St. Augustine's College in North Carolina for the first two of a total of four years he taught there.

While teaching at St. Augustine's, Franklin, who had completed the residency requirement for the Ph.D. degree between 1937 and 1939, did research for his dissertation, "The Free Negro in North Carolina, 1790-1860." Franklin's dissertation was published in 1943 by the University of North Carolina Press two years after his Ph.D. degree was awarded, continuing the professional publishing career began earlier while he was still a graduate student at Harvard.

Franklin did so well at Harvard his first year of matriculation that several opportunities came his way in subsequent years. He said that when he returned to Harvard to study for the Ph.D. degree, he was "loaded" with scholarship assistance. In general, he said, "I experienced no serious impediment at Harvard." His assessment is that the level of sensitivity of the university has increased over the years. "It definitely was not immune from racism when I was there," he observed. But "I decided that if Harvard let us in the door, that was enough. I would take it from there. So I experienced no serious impediments." For Franklin the young scholar, Harvard was "a tremendous experience."

At stated before, Franklin attributed his capacity to deal with Harvard without awe to "the sense of self-confidence that he had developed in high school and the education and support he received in college." In essence, Franklin's Harvard education was successful because it was built on a firm foundation anchored in Tulsa, Oklahoma and Nashville, Tennessee.

Career

Stage I

Franklin's professional career proceeded about as smoothly as his education. Franklin spent a year at his alma mater as an instructor after receiving his M.A. degree. But his first real professional appointment that was the beginning of a career as a professional historian in 1939 was at St. Augustine's College in Raleigh, North Carolina. Although his Ph.D. degree had not been awarded, Franklin was hired at St. Augustine's as a professor because rank meant very little. Thus Franklin, a young scholar only 24 years of age, began his academic career at the highest academic rank. The school in which he taught, of course, was not as competitive as some with which he later would affiliate. Franklin remained at that post four full years and then moved on for another four years at North Carolina College, a predominantly black state-supported institution in Durham, North Carolina. Then at 32 he went to Howard University, Washington, D.C., as professor of history.

Stage II

It was during the nine-year period of his tenure at Howard University that Franklin's career as a historian flourished; 1947, the year he moved to the District of Columbia, was the same year in which the first edition of his most widely read book, From Slavery to Freedom, was published by Alfred A. Knopf. It was the period when he completed research on his own favorite of his books, The Militant South. These were the years when Franklin and other social scientists made history by contributing their research skills to the preparation of the case that resulted in the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court opinion in Brown v. Board of Education that outlawed segregation in public education.

Franklin is most pleased about his participation in the preparation of the school-desegregation court case. First, he found such action compatible with his own inclination to "mainstream." Second, he sees no conflict between scholarship and action in public affairs; "both are part of the whole me." Such involvement, according to Franklin, "is a way of enhancing and deepening one's understanding of what is going on." For three months, while teaching at Howard, Franklin devoted about four days a week to the Brown case. His specific responsibility was to research the debates and circumstances associated with the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The Court wanted to know if the framers of the amendment understood that the Court could construe the amendment as abolishing segregation. He personally assesses that effort as "one of the best examples of historians influencing public policy."

Franklin justifies his involvement in public policy-making as a survival stratagem. If he is to survive as a scholar, he said, he also has to survive as a man, as a black man. Franklin believes that the black scholar must perform a dual role of practicing scholarship that adheres to the highest standards in the field, and of advocating justice and equality. This dual approach will enable the black academician "to be heard as a scholar and to survive as a human being." With such a philosophy of life to motivate him, John Hope Franklin has been ceaselessly involved in public affairs.

Franklin described his time in Washington as "the golden years of Howard." He was experiencing comprehensive development as a professional scholar and as a man of public affairs. He associated with a variety of exciting people at Howard University such as Rayford Logan, the historian, the sociologist E. Franklin Frazier, the specialist in English Sterling

Brown, and the philosopher Alain Lock. "Yet," he said, "there was something that was not quite right at that time."

The something-that-was-not-quite-right was the fact that Franklin's professional opportunities were restricted largely to segregated settings. All four schools in which he had taught were predominantly black. He specialized in the history of the South. But as late as 1948, no black historian had been recognized as worthy of presenting a professional paper at the annual meetings of the Southern Historical Association. In 1956, a white historian expressed doubts about the value of Franklin's manuscript on The Militant South because of the author's race, and questioned whether the book that was widely and favorably reviewed should be published. Segregation was an impediment to one who wished to be part of the mainstream.

As mentioned earlier, Franklin was always ready to respond to a challenge. This he did by breaking the color line that W. E. B. DuBois had forecast as "the problem of the twentieth century" (DuBois, 1903). In 1949, he became the first black historian to read a paper before the Southern Historical Association. He, together with lawyers and other social scientists, destroyed legal sanctions for racial segregation in public education in the Brown v. Board of Education case of 1954. And by 1956, Franklin was ready to break the color line against the employment of black historians in high-level positions in predominantly white colleges and universities.

Stage III

As a continuation of his effort to be part of the mainstream, Franklin accepted an invitation to come to Brooklyn College in New York City as professor and chairman of the Department of History.

Franklin visualized the Brooklyn situation as a new opportunity to contribute to the field of history. In addition to writing and doing research at Brooklyn, he took on the challenge of uniting a split department: "I quelled arguments and was able to smooth out the problems." Serving for eight years as chairman of the History Department, Franklin described his Brooklyn experience as "a marvelous time."

After 25 years of solid work as a scholar that included the writing of a half-dozen books, the editing of four others, and the preparation of more than 21 articles and chapters in books, Franklin's reputation began to soar as he turned 50. In addition to his publications, many people knew Franklin because of the many papers that he had read at meetings of professional associations.

Stage IV

Now it was the University of Chicago that sought his services. The twentieth century was nearly two-thirds spent, and Franklin, a scholar of note, had not been recruited for a permanent appointment by any of the most distinguished departments of history in the United States. The University of Chicago launched a campaign to attract Franklin to its campus and to rectify this omission. Franklin, of course, had been offered appointments at other prestigious universities, but not in his field. The University of Chicago understood the significance of Franklin's unique contribution as an authority on the history of the South. It was able to understand and make a proper assessment of Franklin's talents, probably, because it "had the oldest chair in southern history outside the South" (Star, 1977:29).

The University of Chicago sent an emissary to Europe, where Franklin was on leave from Brooklyn, to determine his possible response to an invitation to join its faculty.

Franklin informed the emissary that his intention was to continue his scholarly career, that he had rejected opportunities for ambassadorial and other public-service appointments. Whether or not he would consider an invitation to join the faculty of the University of Chicago was an issue that he would have to decide when the invitation was extended. Sensing that Franklin might respond favorably, and wishing to nail down a commitment before others might approach him, the University of Chicago, even before he visited the campus, offered John Hope Franklin a tenured professorship. Five years later it named him the first John Matthews Manly Distinguished Service Professor of History. With the ebullience characteristic of his response to all his professional opportunities, Franklin called his 16 years at the University of Chicago (3 of which were served as chairman of the Department of History) "a most satisfying intellectual experience." Retiring from the University of Chicago in 1982, he [redacted] retains the rank of emeritus professor.

John Hope Franklin had to initiate his scholarly activities. But subsequently promotional opportunities in career development were initiated by others. He preferred that his career unfold this way: "I have never been the kind of person who schemes and plans his moves, who plans to be at one place now and then at another later."

Public and Professional Honors

In his younger years, Franklin was generous in his praise of others, especially those who worked for and with him. In his mature years, others have heaped praise upon him. In almost every year beyond his fiftieth birthday, a new honor has come Franklin's way. For example, at the age of 52 years, Franklin was president of the American Studies Association; at 56, president of the Southern Historical Association. The United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa installed him as president the year in which he was 58. He served as president of the Organization of American Historians when he was 59; finally, he was elected to the presidency of the American Historical Association when he was 64.

Beyond these professional honors, Franklin was inducted into the Oklahoma Hall of Fame when he was 63 years old, and was given an honorary degree by Harvard University in 1981 when he was 66, 40 years after he earned a Ph.D. degree from that school.

John Hope Franklin is the kind of person who can come home again. He returned to the city of his youth to receive an honorary degree from the University of Tulsa. He returned to each of the universities from which he graduated -- Fisk and Harvard -- to receive an honorary degree. He returned to two of the schools in which he was a former faculty member -- Howard and Brooklyn -- to receive honorary degrees. All told, he has been so honored by more than 60 colleges and universities in the United States and by Cambridge University in England. (The Cambridge honor is amusing in that Franklin, who flirted with the idea in graduate school, decided against specializing in British history because he thought that he never would be able to visit that country.)

Personal Characteristics

John Hope Franklin is a cosmopolitan person. He has visited England, Russia, China, Japan, India, several countries in Africa, and others in

Europe, Asia, and elsewhere.

John Hope Franklin's public life and private life are coordinated and unified so that each is supported and sustained by the other. His best-selling book From Slavery to Freedom is dedicated to Aurelia, whom he married when he was 25 years old in 1940, after he had completed his residency requirements for the Ph.D. degree at Harvard and one year before the degree was awarded.

Others have put their trust in John Hope Franklin, and Franklin has put his trust in his wife. He said, "She always has had a good feeling about what was happening to me and knew what was appropriate." Married more than 40 years, Franklin values his wife's advice on professional as well as on personal matters. The two met at Fisk and have been "going together since college days." Reflecting upon their union and its meaning for his career, Franklin emphatically said, "I know my life would not have been as stable personally as it has been, if it had not been for my wife."

The Franklins have one son, a graduate of Stanford University. He is adept in languages and speaks French fluently. Their son, whom the father describes as "friendly, handsome, very able, and relates well to others," has lived in Africa for several years and teaches English as a foreign language in Dakar, Senegal.

In addition to his warm and sustaining family, Franklin's other support of a life of productive scholarship is, in his words, "an enormous amount of energy." He acknowledges that he is tenacious and that he labors to overcome obstacles: "I can work longer and harder than most people. My work day is very long." Equally important, Franklin is enthusiastic about what he does. He has recreational interests that round out his personality. He can play a vigorous game of tennis and be a gentle gardner who cultivates orchids.

Franklin is truly a man of many interests that are manifested in his private and public lives. His "Reader" on the struggle for civil rights, for example, includes cartoons, speeches, statistics, excerpts from state laws, other documents, and the results of public-opinion polls (Franklin and Starr, 1967). In his greenhouse of orchids, there are more than 500 rare plants (Star, 1977:33), a bloom from one of which is usually exhibited everyday in his lapel.

John Hope Franklin is a man with a magnificant mind and a gentle manner.

Analytic Summary

The summary of this case study of the historian John Hope Franklin will focus on the various stages of his family, education, and career. The length of time required to complete each stage will be noted. Also the summary will discuss some of the significant events that linked the various stages in his life history.

The preschool and public-school stages in education were enhanced by the events of day care, an arrangement that involved daily placement on the back bench of Franklin's mother's classroom. The learning that took place there gave Franklin a head start in his elementary and secondary education. He never lost the momentum of this head start and graduated at the top of his high-school class.

Meanwhile, since he was ahead in the development of reading and other cognitive skills, Franklin had time to develop some mechanical skills such as typing and shorthand, as well as self-confidence. This latter learning he found most beneficial in education at the graduate level. Franklin finished the preschool and public-school sections of the education process in 16 years.

The knowledge that Franklin's parents had of good centers of higher education available to blacks and the experience of his own brother, who attended Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee, were significant events that linked the public-education stage in Franklin's education to college. Franklin also went to Nashville for his college studies, and also matriculated at Fisk.

During the college stage Franklin was inspired intellectually, selected history as a vocation, learned to work as secretary to the librarian, and experienced a trusting relationship with a young woman whom he later married. The head start he had in the development of reading and other cognitive skills, Franklin enhanced in college; his self-confidence deepened because of the support that he received from his history teacher, who became his mentor. Graduating magna cum laude, with a deepened sense of confidence, some knowledge of work, and demonstrated evidence that teachers and companions are trustworthy, Franklin completed the college stage of higher education in four years.

The mentor's knowledge of Harvard University, his belief in Franklin's intellectual capacity, his advice to Franklin to apply to Harvard, and his securing of a bank loan to finance the first year of Franklin's graduate study were significant events that enabled Franklin to participate in the graduate-school stage of the higher-education process. Franklin's good grades, his deepened sense of self-confidence, and his capacity to trust his mentor were other events. And Harvard's acceptance of Franklin was the final event that facilitated further participation in graduate education.

Franklin emerged from the graduate-school stage of the education process with new knowledge -- knowledge of different areas of the world, knowledge of various religious, social, and political movements and how they shape society, knowledge of how to transcend the effects of racism in an institution that is relatively insensitive to minorities, knowledge of how to work as a teacher, knowledge of how to do research, and knowledge of how to express oneself clearly in scientific papers that are publishable. Franklin assimilated this knowledge and these skills in six years.

Meanwhile, Franklin had a job while he was doing research to complete his dissertation. The job was an event that facilitated the transition from formal education to career development. Moreover, the fact that the beginning of his career process overlapped the ending of his formal-education process contributed to the ease with which he could begin a family-development process one year before his doctoral degree was awarded.

Franklin's career also can be summarized in terms of stages of sequential development. The beginning years of his career process were the eight years he spent at two different colleges in North Carolina. There, he concentrated on teaching, research, and writing. The second stage of his career consisted of the nine years that he spent at Howard University. He refined his skills in teaching, research, and writing, and developed new skills in public affairs and in policy analysis. The third stage of his career consisted of the eight years that he spent at Brooklyn College. There he consolidated his earlier developed skills in teaching, research, writing, and public affairs, and then effectively developed new skills in administration. In the fourth stage of his career at the University of Chicago, Franklin consolidated his earlier skills learned in North Carolina and in Washington. He refined his administrative skills developed in New York and developed new skills in coordinating the growth and development of national learned societies. These sequences represent an ever-increasing range of skills learned and utilized in the pursuit of a professional career.

The career of John Hope Franklin as an "ideal type" demonstrates what a professional historian should do and when a professional historian should do it, if one wishes a career that could be described as "golden," "marvelous," and "a most satisfying intellectual experience."

Franklin's career moved smoothly and with dispatch through the appropriate stages, as already mentioned. It is possible that it progressed well because he initiated his career only two years before the final stage of his formal education ended. And he initiated marriage, the third stage in family development, one year after his career had begun. These happenings occurred between the ages of 24 and 26 years. The life of John Hope Franklin represents a creative interaction in time and space between the structured events of family, education, and career development.

Chapter 5

W. ARTHUR LEWIS

A FLEXIBLE AND MANY-SIDED ECONOMIST

He is a knight, decorated in 1963 at Buckingham Palace. His armament is his fine mind, which he uses well to benefit humanity. Attesting to this, Sir William Arthur Lewis was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1979 for his pioneering work in development economics. A reserved, quiet, mild-mannered man, an honorable man, strong-willed, tenaciously independent, and when necessary obstinate, he has traveled with the high and mighty but has dedicated his career to understanding the economic situation of the meek and lowly.

A New Economic Model

Lewis said, "The vast majority of the world are poor. I was puzzled by this. I started from scratch and developed a new model for understanding this. In effect, the work I did in development repudiated my earlier work. My dissertation was in industrial economics." To explore and explain development economics was a sensible thing to do in the light of his background. W. Arthur Lewis was born in 1915 on St. Lucia, an island in the West Indies that at the time of his birth was part of the colonial empire of Great Britain.

Economic models are useful and planning techniques are helpful. Lewis urges both the developing and the developed worlds to use these aids in "sensible policy-making" (Lewis, 1966:87). He counsels against "large and spectacular projects that cause considerable waste of capital" and, advocates "balanced growth [in public services and commodities], in the proportions dictated by demand [as] the right path," the sensible path to take by a developing country (Lewis, 1966:67-101).

Inevitably there are richer and poorer areas in any nation. This fact illustrates what John Rawls calls the principle of difference (Rawls, 1971:101). A sensible economic plan invests the nation's resources in those areas with the best productive prospects, and promotes full integration in which the citizens in one area have a right to participate equally in economic activity in any part of one's country. Even if there is full integration, he explained, there will be resistance to the proposition that resources be invested where they are most productive. This resistance "derives from the expectation that those who live where the resources are invested are going to benefit most." Lewis acknowledges that there is a reasonable basis for this expectation, and suggests a way of minimizing it: "using some of the wealth produced in the richer areas to finance improved facilities in the poor areas, thus buying their consent to concentration of development policies in the area with the best prospects" (Lewis, 1966:69).

This idea shows the philosophical dimension of Lewis, who as a development economist usually is preoccupied with pragmatic concerns and practical outcomes. But he is equally interested in philosophical enquiry because of his belief that "economic growth depends both upon technological knowledge about things and living creatures, and also upon social knowledge about man and his relations with his fellow man" (Lewis, 1955:164).

Lewis' recommendation concerning how to minimize resentment of a policy that concentrates national resources in those limited areas that offer the best prospects for productive development is confirmed by the philosophical analysis of others. John Rawls, philosopher and author of A Theory of Justice, observes that no one merits greater natural capacity or deserves a more favorable starting place. Yet these distinctions do not have to be eliminated to be fair. According to Rawls, "the basic structure can be arranged so that these contingencies work for the good of the least fortunate." Since the superior potential for development of some areas is due to circumstances for which no one can claim credit, none should gain or lose because of one's artibrary place in the distribution of natural assets "without giving or receiving compensating advantages in return." In other words, "those who have been favored by nature ... may gain from their good fortune only on terms that improve the situation of those who have lost out" (Rawls, 1971:101-104). Lewis' scheme provides for the giving and receiving of compensating advantages to obtain consent for an investment policy that is not applicable universally.

Development planning, as conceived by Lewis, is based on the "criterion of mutual benefit." From the standpoint of common sense, according to Rawls, this criterion should fulfill the more advantaged and the less advantaged (Rawls, 1971:104). This kind of planning must be fostered by the government. "No country," said Lewis, "has made economic progress without positive stimulus from intelligent governments" (Lewis, 1955:366). Thus, "sensible people do not get involved in arguments about whether economic progress is due to government activity or to individual initiative; they know that it is due to both, and they concern themselves only with asking what is the proper contribution of each" (Lewis, 1955:376). So goes the sensible economics of W. Arthur Lewis, who tells us that "the secret of successful planning lies more in sensible politics and good public administration" (Lewis, 1966:7).

Peer and Public Recognition

Despite Lewis' mild manner and sensible approach, the brilliant formulation of his theory and model of development economics had broken through and has had a major influence in far-flung sectors of the world. In our nationwide survey of minority and majority economists who are leaders in the field, Lewis was nominated most frequently by scholars in both groups as outstanding. When the names of four blacks who received multiple nominations was submitted to a random sample of 98 members of predominantly white and predominantly black national economic organizations, an overwhelming vote of two-thirds identified W. Arthur Lewis as the most outstanding black scholar of economics in the United States. As mentioned before, his work in development economics was recognized in the awarding of the Nobel Prize. Lewis has been recognized by his professional peers internationally and elected to the high office of president or vice president in two nationwide professional associations in Ghana and the United States. And Great Britain, which he served during the decade of the 1940s and early 1950s in a number of positions such as principal of the Board of Trade, member of the Colonial Economic Advisory Council, director of the Colonial Development Corporation, and member of the Departmental Commission on Fuel and Power, decorated him with the ancient and honorable title, Knight Bachelor.

The influence of W. Arthur Lewis on the field of economics has been extensive. An examination of the Social Science Citation Index for a two-year period, 1975 and 1976, confirms this assertion. Approximately 21 different works prepared by Lewis over the years were cited during this period by several authors in at least 106 social-science journals. The study on labor in the West Indies by Lewis that was published in 1939, a year before he received his Ph.D. degree, was continuing to be cited a third of a century later. This fact testifies to the persisting value of the products of his scholarship.

Lewis' seminal article on "Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour," published in the Manchester School journal in May 1954, has also had a major impact. Among other themes, it analyzed the growth of profits and of savings relative to income. This article has been cited over the years; during the two-year study period, it was cited in 55 different journals throughout the world, such as Journal of Economic Studies, American Economic Review, Oxford Bulletin of Economic Studies, and World Development, to name a few. His book The Theory of Economic Growth, published in 1955, was cited 18 times; and his 1966 book Development Planning was cited five times. Together these three works accounted for two-thirds of the citations of works by W. Arthur Lewis listed in the 1976 Social Science Citation Index. There is nothing "trendy" about the scholarship of this economist. What he writes has an enduring quality. He is an economist for economists. Most of his work is cited by economists in economics journals.

Family Background

Home Community

The rise of a native son of St. Lucia Island to such prominence as one of the leading economic scholars in the world is an important story to tell. The setting of origination may hold part of the answer to the secret of the success of W. Arthur Lewis. His island home of 238 square miles was part of the British West Indies when he was a lad, and had a population of less than 100,000 people. The island was settled by the French in the late 1600s but came under the control of the British early in the 1800s. Although a British commissioner resided there until its colonial status was dissolved in 1979, French culture left an indelible mark. Arthur Lewis participated in these two cultures and the indigenous folkway of the island people. He attended both British-oriented and French-oriented schools in the days of his youth. These experiences undoubtedly contributed to his cosmopolitan outlook as well as to his concern for what happens to folk in developing societies. In later years, he researched and visited countries on several continents.

Family of Orientation

Probably a more profound influence upon the education and career development of Lewis was his family of orientation. His mother was a major influence in his life. She managed to support the family with a dry-goods business that she opened after Lewis' father died when Lewis was 7 years old. There were five siblings, all brothers including W. Arthur Lewis, in the household that George and Ida Lewis established.

"My parents were teachers," Lewis said. "They were educated in teacher-training schools in Antigua." The teacher-training course did not require four years of study. Thus, his mother and father attended college but did not graduate. His mother gave up teaching after she married but returned to the labor force as a business woman when she was widowed. "I never found out how she managed to establish and support us; but she did, on the income from the business."

Lewis and his brothers had high aspirations. They were encouraged to follow through and to seek whatever education was required to fulfill their vocational ambitions. "Going to England to study was not unusual for people in the British West Indies," Lewis said. He went to England. Before that, others in has family had gone abroad for their education. One brother had gone away to study medicine; another went to Africa; still another brother studied law and became a judge.

Lewis' wife, Gladys Isabel Jacobs, who came from Grenada, went to England to study too. She and he met there and made plans to marry. They had known of each other before since both families had roots in Antigua. Mrs. Lewis' mother died when she was 9 years old. Her father, a teacher who attended a teacher-training college, [redacted] wanted his children to get a good education. So he encouraged his daughter Galdys, who was one of four offspring, to go abroad. Her two brothers are professionals, a lawyer and a priest. Her sister is married to a clergyman. Gladys finished a teacher-training program affiliated with the University of London, which also is the university home of the London School of Economics, where her husband-to-be first studies and then taught.

Family of Procreation

After completing her course of study in London, Gladys returned to Grenada, and Lewis went there also for the wedding. The two were married in 1947, when Lewis was 32 years of age, and returned to London. He was 10 years beyond college, already had his Ph.D. degree, and had been working as a member of the faculty of the London School of Economics for six years. When the interview for this study was conducted, the Lewises had lived together as husband and wife for 34 years.

Two daughters, to whom Mrs. and Mrs. Lewis are devoted, issued forth from their union. The family traveled together often. Often Mrs. Lewis and the children accompanied Professor Lewis because he did not want to leave the children behind with strangers. Of her husband, his work, and the family, Mrs. Lewis said, "He has always involved us somehow and we like it." She described her career as "being close to the family" so that her husband could do work without unnecessary interruptions. But, she said, her husband would "come home and do things with the children such as taking the daughters for walks in the park." Both said that the presence of the children "always heightened the occasion" such as the time when Sir Arthur was knighted. The whole family went to Buckingham Palace for the ceremony.

The daughters have grown up, completed college, and received graduate education. One works in hospital administration and the other, in computer science. As stated by their mother, "They have moved out in the world." Their father muses, "I still enjoy them very much." The family of procreation that Gladys and Arthur Lewis established appropriately can be characterized as a warm and loving group of mutually interdependent members who sustain and support each other. Of his wife and children, Lewis said, "I cannot begin to speak of what I owe to their affection" (Lewis, 1955:6).

Education

Lewis attended high school at St. Mary's College in St. Lucia, which he described as "a private Catholic school whose expenses were paid by the government." Then he went to London in 1933 to study for a bachelor's degree in commerce.

Lewis intended to be a lawyer. When he first enrolled in the London School of Economics, he said, "I had no idea what economics was." Many of his courses for the commerce degree had to do with law. In fact, he passed the first-level examination in law. Because of his good record as an undergraduate student, Lewis was offered a scholarship by the London School of

Economics to study for the Ph.D. degree in economics. The scholarship changed his vocational plans. Lewis doubted that he would have become an economist if he had not been offered it.

Thus, at the age of 22 years, Lewis chose his vocation and committed himself to a rigorous course of graduate study in the field of economics. Three years later, he earned a doctoral degree without the preliminary step of earning a master's degree. Only 25 years old, Lewis had completed his formal education. His college and gradute school degrees were obtained from the same institution, the London School of Economics. This school recognized his talent sufficiently to offer him also his first professional employment.

Career

Stage I

Just one year after he began studying for the doctoral degree, Lewis was appointed assistant lecturer at the London School of Economics at the age of 23 years. He worked at this rank for two years before his degree was officially awarded. Then he became lecturer and reader, and remained as an official member of the faculty for a decade. "I stayed on to work in London because there was no employment then in the British Indies. I stayed on at the London School of Economics because the World War was on and there were not any offers from elsewhere. Also, I was going up the ladder with no difficulty."

Lewis went up the career ladder with no difficulty not only because of the momentum from his brilliant academic performance, but also because of his contribution to the field of economics by way of published works. In 1940, the year his Ph.D. degree was awarded, his first book was published. It was entitled Economic Problems of Today.

Reflecting upon the first decade of his manhood, Lewis said, "There were not many blacks in Britain then." There are large numbers of blacks and Indians now in British universities. Lewis, however, experienced no difficulty in obtaining employment. "After the initial appointment to the faculty of a British university, the burden is on the institution to prove that you should not be retained. Thus, reappointments are normal." However, after that, Lewis emphasized that one must establish oneself: "You cannot rely on the person who brought you to a place. You cannot be dependent on patronage. You have to establish yourself." This, he did early on through his teaching, research, and writing. "My name got known in the profession because of articles I wrote in the early part of my career." At that time, Lewis was still a bachelor and was able to fully concentrate on his studies and then on his developing career.

Stage II

The first five years of his professional career, as stated above, were devoted to teaching, research, and writing. Then Lewis moved into a second stage when he was 28 years old. Staying on at the London School of Economics (Lewis commented that there is much less movement from university to university in the British system than in the American system), he continued to refine his scholarly skills and added to them public policy-making. During a six-year period, 1943 to 1949, while continuing to teach, he participated in the affairs of the government of the United Kingdom by service as a principal of the Board of Trade, then Colonial Office, and as a director of the Colonial Advisory Council. Lewis' career was flourishing. He was known and recognized as a scholar in the university and as a man of public affairs in the United Kingdom.

By the time he reached the thiry-second anniversary of his birth, Lewis' career was settling down well. That was the year in which he married. The second stage in his career extended over a period of five years from 1943 to 1948. He married one year before the end of this stage.

Stage III

Then another momentous event occurred. In 1948, when he was 33 years of age, Lewis was offered an endowed chair as the Stanley Jevons Professor of Political Economy at the University of Manchester. Lewis explained that often in the British system one has to go to a university other than where one was initially appointed to get a full professorship. He remained at Manchester for a decade, although at that time 5 years were spent on leave for assignments in Africa and elsewhere. He continued his teaching, research, and writing, and also expanded his participation in public affairs as a member of the Departmental Committee on Fuel and Power of the United Kingdom, as Economic Advisor to the Prime Minister of Ghana, and as president of the Economic Society of Ghana in 1958. During this stage, which lasted 15 years, he developed administrative skills by leaving the University of Manchester to serve as president of the University of the West Indies from 1959 to 1963. Meanwhile his participation in public affairs was becoming worldwide in its significance. Near the end of this stage, he served as deputy managing director of the United Nations Special Fund while continuing on leave as president of the university.

This was the period in which a change occurred also in his intellectual orientation. Although his dissertation was in applied economics, he shifted his focus during this period to development economics and constructed, as he described it, "from scratch" a new model. In 1954 he published a significant article in the Manchester School journal on development; and in 1955, when he turned 40 years old, he published a comprehensive treatise on The Theory of Economic Growth. He admitted that the range of subject matter that had to be covered in his book was necessarily vast. But he felt compelled to tackle such an enormous task partly because of "irrepressible curiosity" and partly because of "the practical needs of contemporary policy-makers" (Lewis, 1955:5). It was during this period that Lewis discovered ways of linking his applied and theoretical interests in economics to enhance their effect on public policy.

These were activist years for Lewis, who describes them as "taking large bits out of a life of scholarship." These remarks are especially relevant for the two years he spent in Africa on leave from his teaching position in Manchester, and the four years he spent as a university administrator in the West Indies. "When I came back to scholarship and research, I had to work doubly hard to get back into the field." Nevertheless, Lewis affirms that what he was doing as an administrator was "worthwhile in its own terms. I learned much from administration: you learn that it is difficult to get people and institutions to change; there is no way to learn that except by being in the process. Administrative work teaches you how long it takes to get from A to B." Although he admits that there is value in doing administrative jobs and that he learned much from administration, Lewis still contends that "administration and research are contradictory."

Stage IV

Thus in 1962, when the federation of Trinidad, Barbados, Jamaica, and other islands in the West Indies broke up, Lewis decided to return to research and teaching. Princeton University sent an emissary to the West Indies to deliver an invitation to Lewis to join its Department of Economics.

When he was 48 years old, Lewis accepted the Princeton invitation and moved to the United States to become James Madison Professor of Political Economy. While his contribution to the field continued with 7 more books authored or edited as a Princeton professor between 1963 and 1978 (making a total of 12 and averaging nearly 1 book every 3 years since the first was published in 1940), Lewis suddenly was showered with honors from everywhere. More universities in Africa, the United States, England, Europe, and the West Indies joined the lengthening list of those that awarded him an honorary degree. He was decorated as a knight in 1963 and served as vice president of the American Economic Association in 1965 at the age of 50 years. Finally, his career was capped in the awarding of the Nobel Prize for his work in development economics in 1979, when he was 64 years of age. Meanwhile, he managed to continue to use and develop his administrative skills. Between 1970 and 1973 he served on leave as president of the Caribbean Development Bank and then returned to Princeton.

Lewis looked forward to this stage in his career. By 1981, stage IV had spanned 18 productive years. He considered the invitation from Princeton, in his words, "as an opportunity to stop sitting on committees and to get back to doing research." This, he did without hesitation; during his first 6 years at Princeton he published 4 books -- 2 in 1966 (*Politics in West Africa* and *Development Planning*) and 2 in 1969 (*Some Aspects of*

Economic Development and Aspects of Tropical Trade, 1883-1965).

Lewis' professional peers and the academy further recognized his scholarly achievements and conferred more honors upon him during this stage. Lewis was elected distinguished fellow in the American Economic Association. Manchester University, where he was first appointed as full professor, awarded him an honorary Doctor of Science degree in 1973, 25 years after he first came to it. This degree, together with the one he received from the University of the West Indies in 1966, means that two of the four institutions of higher education in which Sir Arthur Lewis worked have given him one of their highest honors.

Personal Characteristics

What manner of man is W. Arthur Lewis? Earlier, he was characterized as a quiet, mild-mannered person. The record shows also that he is a sensible and serious scholar and a determined man who has worked hard to merit the opportunities that have come his way. His determination could take on the character of a driving obsession were it not tempered by a genuine capacity to be grateful. He is quick to express his indebtedness to others, including his family and professional colleagues (those known and unknown by him personally) and his gratitude for the assistance and help they rendered that facilitated his work.

His achievements far exceed the requirements of the situations in which he found himself. In this respect he can be classified as an over-achiever. There is purpose to his hard work and extraordinary effort. Lewis recalled that when he went to England not many blacks were in British universities. Years later, when he came to the United States, he discovered that Princeton had a reputation of discrimination. His thoughts were that it would be of value if one could overcome these barriers. Lewis believed that he personally had to establish himself to overcome, that he could not depend on patronage or any other support system.

Lewis set out to establish himself by going beyond the call of duty in all his undertakings. Consequently, he went up the ladder without impediments wherever he was, in English or American universities. He felt compelled to do this because always he wanted to be in a position "to quit tomorrow and still get a job." Realizing that he could do this because of the quality of his work has made a big difference in his career, Lewis said. His belief in this goal is the basis for describing him as tenaciously independent.

Lewis also should be described as a flexible person who is capable of changing when the circumstances and conditions of life warrant a change. He described his movement into development economics in the 1950s as repudiation of much of his earlier work. He did not consider this to be unusual and conjectured that "it must happen to a lot of scholars." Unfortunately, many scholars are not as flexible as Lewis. Some resist accepting new interpretations even when the facts demonstrate that old interpretations are wrong. But Lewis is not one of these.

In his theory book in 1955 Lewis asserted that no country has made economic progress without positive stimulus from intelligent governments. But after observing "the cruel events of the year 1966" in Nigeria and before the outcome of the civil war in that nation was clear, he asserted that "economic progress depends more on people and resources than it does on governments." This assertion, slightly at variance with the earlier one, was based on experience. During the years after The Theory of Economic Growth had been written, Lewis observed in many places that a common currency, unrestricted transportation, and a minimum of bureaucratic licensing are essentials for economic growth (Lewis, 1967:5). His analysis was that Nigeria was likely to retain these despite breakdown in its government. If it could do so, he said, economic development should resume after the war, since "this resulted more from the adaptability of the farmers, the enerygy of the business community, and the resources of the country, than from anything that the governments were doing" (Lewis, 1967:5).

Lewis assigns a high place to experience and pragmatics as well as to theory and philosophy in his economic analysis. Consequently, he tries to provide both operational guidelines and theoretical concepts. Economics has turned out to be a mathematical science. At one point in his career he served as president of the Manchester Statistical Society. Yet he feels comfortable writing a book "for the intelligent layman." "Very little has appeared on how a Development Plan is made, what the chief snags are, and what distinguishes good planning from bad," he said. The person in the street whose life is affected by those plans needs "a short and simple introduction" that can help him. Lewis gave himself the task of doing this in his book on Development Planning (1966), just as he had assigned himself the task of preparing The Theory of Economic Growth (1955) because it was needed by policy-makers.

Lewis, a pragmatist and a philosopher, has pitched his career in the direction in which it has moved not so much for fame and fortune as for the purpose of being helpful and serving others by filling a void of needed information. To follow a career pattern such as that which Lewis has followed is possible only among those who are self-confident. Apparently Lewis' socialization and early experiences nurtured the development of such confidence, which in turn has contributed to his sense of freedom and flexibility in determining what to study and how to present his results.

Analytic Summary

This summary will focus largely on the family, education, and career development of W. Arthur Lewis and the interaction between these three systems.

The birth of a black person into a household that lived in a British possession during the age of colonialism was a significant event in that it established the conditions that one had to overcome. Within his kinship system the educational accomplishments of Lewis' mother and father during an age when few blacks received postsecondary education indicate their orientation toward achievement, which obviously was passed on to their offspring. The death of his father when Lewis was only 7 years old must have created a serious void in his family. But the extraordinary compensating behavior of his mother succored and sustained him and his siblings. She had to go into the labor force as a self-employed business woman to do this. Consequently she was able to provide an umbrella of safety and security for the members of her family until they departed from the household after college. One may call stage I in the kinship system the period of nurturance in the family of orientation. For Lewis this period extended through the completion of college, the end of stage III in the education system.

For the next ten years, Lewis withdrew from the direct care of his family of orientation and moved into what became for him a transitional independent-household stage II. During this stage Lewis initiated and completed stage IV in the education system, that of graduate education.

Lewis completed this stage and received his Ph.D. in the record time of only three years. The stage of graduate study in the higher-education process began immediately after Lewis had completed the college stage III at the age of 22 years.

Two years before he received his Ph.D. degree, Lewis received his first professional appointment, as assistant lecturer, which launched his professional career into stage I of that system at the age of 23 years. He moved rapidly in five years through stage I in career development, teaching, doing research, and writing. When Lewis was 28, he began stage II of his career. It too lasted five years. Although remaining at the London School of Economics, Lewis became a full lecturer and reader, refined his skills he had developed in teaching, research, and writing, and branched out into public affairs as a policy-maker. All this occurred while Lewis was in stage II of the kinship system, occupying the position of an independent householder. He was able to concentrate on education and career development because of the absence of family responsibility in the kinship system.

One year before he moved into stage III of his career, which took on worldwide significance for a period of 15 years, Lewis married. Thus stage III, the family of procreation, was launched by Lewis one year before stage III in his professional career. Lewis was 32 years old when he married, and 33 when he received his first appointment as full professor at Manchester University.

Stage III in Lewis' career development consolidated his earlier skills in teaching, research, and writing, refined his policy-making skills that began developing in stage II, and initiated the development of new

6-20

skills in administration. Moreover, Lewis assumed leadership responsibility for the growth and development of his discipline as a national leader of a professional association. His book-publishing activity continued during this stage bringing the number of books written to 5.

Lewis did all this so well that he was decorated as a knight as stage IV of his career began. Stage IV brought Lewis to the United States, where he has served with distinction as the James Madison Professor of Political Economy at Princeton University. At the time of this study, stage IV had lasted 18 years. The other public honor of note that was to come his way during stage IV was the Nobel Prize for his pioneering work in development economics.

During stage IV, which began when he was 48 years old, Lewis continued to develop as a scholar. In addition to teaching, he did research and authored or edited 7 more books, bringing the total to 12. He was elected vice president of the American Economic Association, attaining the status of distinguished fellow of that association; served for three years as president of the Caribbean Development Bank (on leave from Princeton); and accepted membership on the Economic Advisory Council of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in the United Stages. Thus, one could call stage IV in the career development of Lewis as a stage of consolidation. Finally, he was the recipient of many public honors.

All during stages III and IV in his career, stage III in his kinship system — the family of procreation — remained intact. This fact undoubtedly had a stabilizing effect upon him. The affection that he received from his wife and two daughters obviously sustained him through the many moves and responsibilities required in the development of a career devoted to the service of others in scholarship, public affairs, administration, and leadership of learned societies.

Chapter 6

Kenneth B. Clark,
A Psychologist Committed to Justice and Equality

For more than 15 years a member of the powerful Board of Regents that oversees education in New York State, Kenneth Bancroft Clark is a scholar who has had a profound effect upon public policy and public education in this nation. Since the midpoint of the twentieth century and the landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision Brown v. Board of Education, Clark's reputation has soared. That decision, delivered by Chief Justice Earl Warren on May 17, 1954, outlawed segregated public education in the United States and was influenced, in part, by the research findings of Clark.

The decision reversed the Court's interpretation of the law 58 years earlier. The Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution guarantees equal protection of the law to all citizens. But in 1896 in Plessy v. Ferguson, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that this clause of the Constitution could be fulfilled under conditions of state-sanctioned segregation, if facilities and services for the various racial populations were equal although separate.

Brown v. Board of Education

The 1954 decision declared that education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments and that it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he or she is denied the opportunity of an education. The Court then examined the effect of segregation itself on public education. After analyzing the evidence, the Court stated its belief that segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other tangible factors may be equal, deprives the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunity. Further, the Court indicated that to separate black children in grade and high school from others of similar age and qualification, solely because of their race, generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. The Court said that this finding is amply supported by modern authority (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954).

In a footnote to the decision, Kenneth B. Clark headed the list of modern social-science authorities whose findings were cited and used by the the Court in arriving at its unanimous opinion that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." The reference was listed this way: K. B. Clark, Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development (Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth, 1950).

The Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth actually met in 1951. Clark summarized the material he had reviewed in the White House Conference report for the appendix of the appellants' brief in the Brown case. The appellants' brief was prepared by the legal staff of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). That appendix, entitled "The Effects of Segregation and the Consequences of Desegregation: A Social Science Statement," was endorsed by 32 social scientists, psychologists, and psychiatrists (Clark, 1974:93). In addition, as a social-science consultant to the NAACP, Clark examined black children involved in several of the cases that were combined in the Brown decision "to determine whether evidence of personality distortion related to racial discrimination and segregation could be ascertained" (Clark, 1974:93). His own assessment of the impact of social-science evidence is reported: "The introduction of social science testimony in these cases," he said, "proved to be a significant extension of legal frontiers" (Clark, 1974:93). But others, such as social psychologist Richard Evans, said that Clark's "contributions to the literature on prejudice and the effects of segregation on blacks in America ... influenced ... our entire culture through [their] impact on the Supreme Court's decision" (Evans, 1980:63).

Teaching and Community Service

Clark has been an activist psychologist in search of justice and equality, moral and ethical truths. From the earliest days of his career, he has pursued these goals, never compromising them even at the risk of losing a job. Immediately after receiving his doctoral degree, Clark went South to teach in a predominantly black college whose president suggested that his "brand of psychology" was contributing to the frustration of students in that he was not helping them "adjust to the realities of American racism." Admitting that he was a bit brash, Clark told the president that he could not do this, and left the position. He lasted less than a year in what could have been his first permanent professional appointment.

City College of New York (later known as City College of the City University of New York) accepted Clark on his own terms as an activist social scientist interested both in teaching and community service. Clark remained at City College his entire professional career as a teacher. From time to time he served as visiting professor at other schools such as Columbia, Harvard, and the University of California at Berkeley, but he always returned to City College, which understood and supported him.

Clark has been recognized nationwide by professional organizations and has served as president of two of the leading learned ~~[illegible]~~ associations of psychology in the United States. His influence has been nationwide and particularly significant over a long period of time on public-policy issues in New York State and in New York City.

Clark believes that the social sciences and social psychology should be and must be "instruments by which people seek to help their fellow human beings" (Evans, 1980:71). In Clark's community service (such as the work he and his wife did at the Northside Center for Child Development, cofounded by them; Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, which he served as chairman and project director; and the Metropolitan Applied Research Center, which he organized), he has been acting out this belief. He has identified the prime goal of social science as "helping society move toward humanity and justice, with minimum irrationality, instability, and cruelty" (Clark, 1965:xxi-xxii).

Clark obtained great satisfaction from teaching. But he also pursued research to achieve the goals mentioned above. His community-service and public-affairs activities have left less time than he would prefer to write up his observations and to share them with other colleagues. Nevertheless, he has written and edited about 7 books and many articles, including a prize-winning book, Dark Ghetto, that earned him the Sidney Hillman Book Award in 1965.

Clark does not apologize for his applied work because he believes that social scientists must "demonstrate the validity of hope" (Clark, 1974:xii). This, he believes, is essential "to the survival of the human species" (Clark, 1974:xii). Because he sees his professional work as having to do with the business of survival, he does not see his involvement in public-policy issues as separate from his work as a social psychologist. "There is not a clear distinction between social psychology and social action; they are one and the same."

Yet Clark is aware of the fact that some professional psychologists take a contrary view. The controversy that his participation in the adversarial school-desegregation court cases engendered was sufficient evidence regarding the negative view that some of the most respected psychologists in the field have of social action and applied social psychology. With full knowledge of the possible professional costs, Clark has continued his dual activity of social-science research and social action. Consequently, Clark was genuinely surprised when he was nominated to be president of the American Psychological Association. He thought that many would dismiss his social action as being of little social-science value.

Our study confirms that Kenneth Clark's brand of psychology has been accepted as worthy by many. When both black and white leaders in psychology were asked to nominate three outstanding black psychologists for our study, Clark's name was mentioned the most frequently. When the names of the three psychologists who received the most nominations were submitted to a random sample of 87 members of black and of white national professional organizations in psychology, 80 percent of the study population ranked Clark as the most outstanding black psychologist. Thus, there is consensus in the discipline that Clark indeed has made major contributions to psychology.

One can say that Clark has pioneered in helping to transform social psychology into a field that takes seriously moral and ethical dilemmas in human behavior, and that applies its finding for ameliorative effect.

Moreover, he has succeeded in effectively transcending barriers of resistance to these concerns. His selection in 1978 at the age of 64 years as the first recipient of the Award for Distinguished Contribution to Psychology in the Public Interest is evidence supporting the assertion that Clark has persevered and has prevailed.

Family Background

How did one who grew up imprisoned in a New York City black ghetto, where material rewards are hard to come by and where the motives of almost everyone are suspect, eventually become a significant source of information for the U.S. Supreme Court and a national president of the American Psychological Association? How did one who attended the Harlem public schools, in which a guidance counselor in junior-high school tried unsuccessfully to steer him into a vocational high school, earn membership in Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, and receive election by the state legislature to the Board of Regents? How did one whose family moved from house to house and from neighborhood to neighborhood in a desperate attempt to escape the ghetto's creeping blight become so stable and steady in adulthood, remaining at one place of employment, City University of New York, 33 years and eventually retiring as Distinguished University Professor Emeritus? The simple answer, according to Kenneth Clark, is two women in his life -- his mother and his wife.

Family of Orientation

Miriam Hanson Clark brought her two children to New York City from the Panama Canal Zone, where they were born when Kenneth Clark was 4 years old and his sister, 1. Clark's parents were born in Jamaica, but their separate families migrated to the Canal Zone in search of work. His mother and father met and married there. His father worked as a superintendent of cargo with the United Fruit Company.

Eventually Arthur and Miriam Clark separated. Clark's mother, whom he describes as "very firm, forthright, and ambitious," wanted her children to have good educational opportunities. She felt that these could not be obtained in the Canal Zone. Without family connections to keep her there, she decided to seek out new opportunities for her young household in New York City, where she had a sister (Clark, 1978:79).

In 1918 Miriam Clark picked up her infant daughter and young son and came to New York. She found work in the garment district as a dressmaker by day, took care of her family, and then went to school at night. Eventually she received a diploma from the evening division of George Washington High School, the same school from which her son would graduate at the age of 16 years as a student in the daytime program.

George Washington High School has much meaning in the current Clark household. Kenneth and Mamie Clark set up a scholarship at that school in memory of his mother, whom Clark called "a strong woman." He recalled an incident before he enrolled in high school that indicates his mother's strong orientation toward education. After learning that the junior-high school counselor was trying to steer her son into a vocational rather than an academic high school (the counselor's way of advising black youngsters to be "realistic" about their employment options), Clark's mother stormed into school one day and said to the counselor: "I don't care where you send your son, but mine is going to George Washington High School." Clark said that his mother was not awed by authority and that her daring ways saved him and his sister (Clark, 1978:79-80).

Clark's mother told him and his sister that they had to go to college. To get ready for college, she insisted that they get good grades in school; she believed that either he would get good grades or he would end up in jail. Amused as he reflected upon this, Clark said, "She didn't give me any middle ground."

She left the decision up to Clark regarding what college he would attend. Clark chose Howard University in Washington, D.C. He had some scholarship money and did not have to work his way through college. His mother gave full support. She worked to put him and his sister through college, and also provided some support for graduate school.

Clark's mother wanted him to study for the priesthood in the Episcopal Church. When he told her that he had decided to major in psychology, she did not know what psychology was but she did not express disappointment; she merely said, "Whatever you do, do it well." Clark understood what his mother was saying.

Family of Procreation

Clark met Mamie Phipps at Howard, where she was a freshman when he was a senior. At that time she told him that he was going to be a great psychologist. Clark said he dismissed her remarks as "courtship talk." Over the years, however, she has believed it and has acted in accordance with her belief; and, in Clark's words, "she has done everything she could to make her prophecy come true." Clark has found her efforts in his behalf a great support.

When Kenneth and Mamie Clark married in 1938, he was 24 years of age, had earned his M.S. degree in psychology from Howard, and was just two years shy of his Ph.D. degree at Columbia. She had just graduated from college. She continued her education; finishing her master's at Howard, she came to New York and eventually became the first black woman to receive a Ph.D. in psychology from Columbia University.

Two children were born to the Clarks. They have grown into adulthood and have offspring of their own, so the Clarks now are grandparents. They have a summer home on Cape Cod where the clan frequently gathers, away from the pressures of the New York City metropolitan area.

At the time of this interview in 1981, the family of procreation created by Kenneth and Mamie Clark had continued as a steady, stable, and supportive unit for 43 years. Kenneth Clark attributes the many years of their effective union in marriage to the fact that his wife is so honest: "She will tell you exactly how she feels." The Clarks continue to work together personally and professionally as they have done over the years.

Miriam Clark, the mother, and Mamie Clark, the wife, are the two persons whom Kenneth Clark has characterized as "strong women who demanded of me the maximum." There was no break in the nurturance that Clark received from strong women. One took over where the other left off.

Education

Preschool, Primary, and Secondary School

Clark's preschool and primary education occurred on streets, playgrounds, and in Harlem schools. Clark described the early years this way: "I started school in the Harlem public schools. I first learned about people, about love, about cruelty, about sacrifice, about cowardice, about courage, about bombast in Harlem" (Clark, 1965:xv). One must conclude on the basis of this testimony that Harlem provided a comprehensive education and a range of advice. In fact, Clark's choice of Howard University for college studies was based on information he received from a Harlem playground attendant who was a medical-school student at Howard.

Clark does not remember much about his teachers in primary and secondary school. One that stands out, however, is Mr. Dixon, a junior-high school speech teacher. Dixon was the first person who let him know that Clark could take ideas and transform them into words in which other people would be interested. After a three-minute speech that Dixon required, Clark remembers that his teacher was "very positive in his reaction to it." He asked Clark to enter an essay contest that was sponsored by a baking company. Although he cannot recall what he wrote, Clark remembers that for the essay he won a gold medal that was presented to him during assembly period. "I was very proud and Mr. Dixon was proud too." In summary, Clark said of his primary and secondary schooling: "I remember the names of only the teachers I admired" (Clark, 1978:79).

Clark also admired his playground attendant. He described her as "a medical student at Howard University in Washington, D.C." and "very attractive" (Clark, 1978:80). She told him about Howard as a school where blacks were in control. Before his college years, he had not experienced a setting where blacks were in control of anything, not even Harlem. "Blacks certainly were not in control in New York when I was growing up," Clark said. For example, there were only 10 black students in his high-school senior class in New York.

B.A. and M.A.

Clark enrolled in Howard University during the Depression years and graduated in 1935, when he was almost 21 years of age. He found Howard an exciting place in terms of personal, social, and intellectual interaction, and enumerated the intellectual giants there with whom he came into contact: Kelly Miller in education, Ralph Bunche in political science, Charles Houston in law, Alain Lock in philosophy, Abram Harris in economics, Sterling Brown in English, and Francis Cecil Sumner in psychology. "These teachers made their students into instruments of change." The teachers were able to accomplish this goal, he said, because they were "our tutors, models, and friends. They were affecting our lives, goals, values. They remained my friends until death."

Clark reserved special praise for Francis Cecil Sumner in psychology. "For me," said Clark, "Sumner was the key at Howard." Clark enrolled in Howard intending to become a physician. During his sophomore year, he enrolled in Sumner's course in Introductory Psychology. Clark started listening to the ideas of this psychology professor, who studied for the doctoral degree at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts.

Sumner was strong on content and substance. "He was the best read person I ever knew. His discussions about man and society caught my attention. Sumner got me interested about man and the world." Although softspoken, "Sumner was uncompromising in insistence on high standards of the students worthy of his attention. I respected the man. I admired him. I leaned on him. He became my mentor and my friend. I became his protégé. Sumner continued to be interested in all that happened to me. He was happy when Mamie and I got married." Sumner had a newsletter that he sent around about his former students, detailing their progress.

Clark attributes his life-long vocation in psychology to the influence of Sumner. "My sophomore year, after listening to Sumner, I immediately decided that I would not continue in my premedical studies. I started taking more courses in psychology and physiology. I never turned back, although I did not go to Howard to major in psychology." Clark remained at Howard for a year of study for the Master of Science degree in psychology after receiving his bachelor's degree. He then taught at Howard as Sumner's protégé. It was Sumner who advised Clark to go away to get his Ph.D. after he had taught at Howard for a year.

Ph.D. Study

Clark moved on to Columbia University to study for the doctoral degree in psychology. He entered Columbia in 1937 and graduated three years later at the age of 26 years.

One reason Clark chose Columbia was his encounter with Otto Klineberg in Washington when Klineberg was a guest lecturer at Howard. Clark was impressed with Klineberg's candor and directness. He was pleased to observe these characteristics in a white person; few talked the way Klineberg talked in his lecture on racial differences. "I suppose I wanted to go into the field that Otto Klineberg was in." Clark studied with Klineberg, who became his mentor and friend, and also with Gardner Murphy.

Clark was able to move through Columbia rapidly because he found "no challenges at Columbia that were more challenging than the standards of Sumner." However, some professors at Columbia were "surprised and amazed," according to Clark, "that a black could meet their standards and even surpass them." He was invited to join Sigma Xi at Columbia, and he ranked number one among those who took the qualifying examination with him for the Ph.D. degree. The head of the program was "so amazed" that he summoned Clark to his office and interrogated him; he asked Clark to account for the fact that he came out ahead of all others who took the examination. None of these attitudes and actions hampered Clark's progress. "It was preordained that I would do well at Columbia when I studied for my Ph.D. degree, because of Sumner."

Although he is best known for his contributions to the literature on prejudice and the effects of segregation on blacks in America, Clark did not do research on race for his dissertation. He studied selective perception, selective recall, and attitudes. and how they influence human behavior. His dissertation was entitled "Some Factors Influencing the Remembering of Prose Material" (Clark, 1940). Actually the research, despite its bland title, was not totally unrelated to what later was to become Clark's major research interest. In his dissertation research, Clark determined the extent to which attitudes toward females who violated stereotypical pictures of the female affected groups of subjects' recall. He found that both men and women tended to remember these females more in terms of the feminine stereotypes than in terms of the original stimulus (Evans, 1980:65). One can identify in Clark's dissertation research an underlying concern with stereotyping and other issues that later he would consider in his studies of race.

At Howard, Clark's interest in injustice had been awakened. The faculty was extraordinary. However, Clark soon learned that these outstanding scholars had congregated at Howard because they could not get appointments to the faculties of Harvard University or Clark University or wherever they received their Ph.D. degrees. "I learned from the discussions at Howard that these men could not teach anyplace other than a predominantly black school." Realization of this fact, he said, was "a turning point for me." Clark did not pursue his awakened interest in injustice immediately, however, because his professors at Columbia suggested that it would be desirable for him "not to come on too strong" in terms of his concern with racial justice.

While some teachers in predominantly white universities discourage blacks from "coming on too strong" about issues of race while they are in residence, at graduation time race is their prevailing thought in terms of placement. For example, Clark said, "when I had finished my graduate studies at Columbia, I was asked if I was going back to teach my people. I told my Columbia professors," Clark recalled, "that my people were all around and I wanted to be recommended for wherever they recommended Columbia graduates." One person who graduated with him already had been reocmmended for a prestigious private university in the East. That person obviously had not performed as well as Clark; and, he said, "I let the people at Columbia know that."

Career

"The people at Columbia settled on City College as the school to which I would be recommended." Gardner Murphy, one of Clark's teachers at Columbia, was going to become the chairperson of the Department of Psychology at City College. Although Murphy welcomed his former student to the City College faculty, he still looked upon the appointment of a black professor "as experimental," Clark said. Clark himself experimented with one or two other employment settings after graduating from Columbia, including teaching for less than a year at Hampton Institute, working with Gunnar Myrdal, and working with the Office of War Information. Unhappy with the circumstances and conditions of employment elsewhere, he sought out the City College option in 1942. It was still available and he accepted an appointment initially to the rank of instructor. Clark was 28 years old, had received his Ph.D. degree two years earlier, and at that time was in the fourth year of his marriage. Thus, City University became the first full-time permanent job in his unfolding career.

Stage I

The first stage in Clark's career extended from 1942 to 1950. During this eight-year period, he immersed himself in teaching, research, and community service. Mamie Clark observed that her husband really thrives on teaching. Kenneth Clark agreed that teaching was so uplifting that he could go into a classroom with a headache or a cold, "and within ten or fifteen minutes I was feeling wonderful." The students he remembers are those who brought to their studies "a passionate sensitivity and a critical probing intelligence." Clark said that Francis Cecil Sumner, his first psychology teacher at Howard, was the model he emulated (Clark, 1978:83).

Teaching has been so important in his life and career that Clark classifies as his "most important contribution" his students -- what they have done as a result of what he has done. Specifically, Clark indicated satisfaction with his students who "take seriously the responsibility of using social science as an instrument for helping their fellow human being" (Evans, 1980:71).

This precisely is what he and his psychologist wife Mamie Clark tried to do in their first community service venture -- the Northside Child Development Center, which they cofounded in 1946. She directed the Center and Clark signed on as research director, while continuing to teach full time at City College. Literally, they were trying to save underprivileged children in Harlem by "building the sense of self as an integral part of ... psychotherapy" (Evans, 1980:68).

The Clarks' research agenda at that time was one on which Mamie Clark had been working while pursuing the master's degree. Her thesis research was a study of self-awareness. Extending this research and developing new instruments, Kenneth and Mamie Clark used dolls and the color test to understand how black children develop a sense of their own identity. This research, begun in the initial stage of Clark's career, was written up and first published by him and his wife in 1947 under the title "Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children" (Clark and Clark, 1947). He was 33 years old when that article was published. Although Clark's research was progressing well, he did not publish extensively during the first eight years of his career. Teaching, research, and community service were his preoccupations then.

Stage II

By Clark's own reckoning, the action part of his career surfaced around 1950 (Clark, 1978:83). It commenced stage II, which extended over the period of a decade, roughly from 1950 through 1959 and his forty-fifth birthday. Beginning when he was 36 years old, this stage commenced with his research for the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth. The report that Clark prepared for the White House Conference, in turn, led to his appointment as a social-science consultant to the NAACP. In addition to continuing his teaching, research, and community service, Clark increased his writing activity and became deeply involved in public-policy matters through his work with the NAACP on its school-desegregation court cases.

Clark describes the sequence of events that launched stage II in his career. His Columbia University advisor, Otto Klineberg, was a member of the Advisory Committee of the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth. Upon Klineberg's recommendation, Clark was asked about two or three months before the conference to synthesize the literature on the effects of race, prejudice, discrimination, and segregation on personality development of American children. Meanwhile, lawyers for the NAACP turned to Klineberg for help in establishing as a fact the inherent psychological damage of segregation for blacks even when facilities for the different racial populations may be equal. Klineberg referred Robert Carter, who was Thurgood Marshall's assistant, to Clark because of the work that Clark did for the White House Conference. Carter was excited about the material in Clark's report and said that it was very much relevant to the school-desegregation cases (Evans, 1980:66-67).

The NAACP then signed him on as a consultant and Clark began advising the lawyers concerning social scientists who would be good expert witnesses. He interviewed children and prepared the social-science appendix for the lawyers' brief. He summarized the essential points of the testimony of the expert witnesses during the trial. Included in the appendix also was material contained in Clark's report for the White House Conference on Children and Youth. The social-science appendix was submitted to the Supreme Court as part of the brief prepared by the NAACP in the Brown case. Clark described his involvement in that historical case as "a highlight" of his career (Clark, 1978:84). This was part of his effort to integrate research activities with applied services, which he feels is another of his contributions to psychology.

Clark praised the City College Department of Psychology for being extraordinarily supportive of his public-policy work with the NAACP in connection with the Brown case. "My colleagues competed to substitute for me in my courses so that I could be away and work on the case. They thought it was an honor for one of their faculty to be involved in a case as important as this." Some of the administrators, however, were not as pleased. One called him in for a conference on the matter. After the conversation, Clark told the administrator, "If you are asking me to make a choice between continuing to work with the lawyers of NAACP or with City College, I am certain what choice I will make." The City College administrator "backed off."

Following the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in 1954, Clark published his first important book, Prejudice and Your Child (1955), a revision of the report that he prepared for the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth on which the Supreme Court, in part, based its school desegregation opinion. Clark was 41 years old. His career was accelerating. During this stage he refined his teaching and research skills, and further cultivated his writing skills and learned how to participate effectively in public-policy matters.

Stage III

When he turned 45 years old, Clark's career was moving full speed ahead and into stage III, which was characterized by teaching, research, writing, public-affairs activities, community service, administration, and leadership of a national learned association. It also was the stage in which he would begin receiving some of the many public honors that would come his way.

Clark served as president of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues in 1959 as the opening event in this stage of his career. A year later, the turbulent decade of the 1960s began. Rewarded for his past contributions to the academic community, Clark was promoted to the rank of full professor at City College of the City University of New York in 1960 at the age of 46 years. Stage III in Clark's career covers the 1960s decade.

During the 1960s Clark did many things and did them well. He chaired and served as project director of the massive delinquency-prevention planning project in Harlem that was sponsored by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime and by the Mayor of the City of New York. In the service that he and Mamie Clark had rendered earlier at the Northside Center for Child Development, it became clear to them that something would have to be done about the environment. Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited (HARYOU) was one structure through which Clark attempted to accomplish this end. This service-planning project in Harlem, where Clark had spent more that 40 of his years, was the final demonstration for him that a social scientist "could never be fully detached" (Clark, 1965:xv).

Clark also learned in the delinquency-prevention planning project that political forces can move in and sap its vitality. This was a dimension of power of which he had been more or less unaware (Evans, 1980:68). In an earlier stage in his career, he had seen political force by way of the Supreme Court make available in an equitable way a public service such as education. Now in the third stage of his career he was witnessing political considerations that were impeding the full implementation of massive public services for a community.

Kenneth Clark is blessed with the capacity to turn his liabilities into assets. As he withdrew from the HARYOU Project after the planning phase so that it could be merged with another community service project in Harlem, Associated Community Teams (ACT), for the implementation phase, he reflected upon all that he had learned in Harlem and in other ghetto communities and wrote a prize-winning book, Dark Ghetto (1965), that presented a profound and insightful analysis of ghetto life and its meaning to the ghetto dwellers. The book was given the Sidney Hillman Book Award for 1965.

That same year — 1965 — Clark was presented the Kurt Lewin Memorial Award by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. His acceptance address, entitled "Problems of Power and Social Change: Toward a Relevant Social Psychology," was an analysis of the role of power in social organization and a challenge to his colleagues in social psychology to cease investigating isolated, trivial, and convenient problems and to start studying problems directly related to urgent social realities (Clark, 1974:68). In this speech Clark conveyed the wisdom he had obtained from both his successes and his failures in dealing with political power. He urged his professional contemporaries to "accept power as an important concept for research" (Clark, 1974:69).

It was during this stage in his career that Clark was elected by the legislature to the powerful Board of Regents of New York State in 1966. He would serve on that board for over 15 years and give oversight to all aspects of education in the state. Meanwhile, Clark's talents were recognized beyond his state. The federal government asked him to serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs Personnel of the State Department, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People gave him the Springarm Medal, one of its most prestigious awards.

Clark also during this time established an organization that would draw upon and consequently develop his administrative skills. In 1967 he became president of the Metropolitan Applied Research Center (MARC), a private nonprofit research corporation established to serve as a catalyst for change and as an advocate for the poor and powerless in American cities. MARC was called an experiment. Possibly its grandest plan was the design of an Academic Achievement Project for public schools in the District of Columbia. The plan was based on the assumption that all normal children can learn if they are taught effectively. The plan specified radical ways in which the local school system would have to be restructured, reorganized, and staffed to accomplish the stated goal. It was never implemented. However, the plan has been published by Clark and the staff of MARC so that others may review it and utilize those aspects that can be accommodated in their local communities (Clark, 1972). MARC was one more illustration that Kenneth Clark refused to limit his activities to the ivory tower. In addition to his contributions as a scholar, Clark always has had to have a community service outlet. If available associations were not appropriate, he would create new ones.

Stage IV

As the decade turned to 1970, Clark was named Distinguished University Professor at City College of the City University of New York. This appointment propelled his career into stage IV. In addition to this recognition, his professional peers in the American Psychological Association elected him to the presidency of that oragnization in 1970-71, when he was 56 years of age. In 1978, when he was 64, he was selected as the recipient of the first Distinguished Contributions to Psychology in the Public Interest Award. Kenneth Clark took early retirement from the City University in 1975, after spending 33 years at that post, when he was 61 years old. Upon retirement, he was awarded emeritus status as Distinguished University Professor.

Clark continues to serve on the New York State Board of Regents, continues to publish (Pathos of Power, 1974 being his most recent book), and continues his public-affairs and community-service activities. As a vehicle for these, he organized a family-consulting firm of which he is president. Clark, Phipps, Clark, and Harris, Inc. is a firm that provides professional consultation on personnel matters with emphasis on human-relations, race-relations, and affirmative-action programs. At the age of 67 years, Clark is still going strong in a "career as a social scientist that has been devoted to translating principles of human behavior into policies and programs that improve the quality of life for the poor and disadvantaged" (Evans, 1980:63).

Personal Characteristics

Kenneth Clark, a man of strong opinions, is unafraid of conflict. Yet he is a kind person with a sense of humor. He empathizes with the poor and the powerless.

Commitment, morality, and ethics are words that flavor his conversations. He can give love; but equally important, he knows how to receive love and to gracefully depend on others. He is full of praise for his mother and his wife as strong people on whom he has depended and who have been supportive of him. Clark believes that it takes courage both to give and to receive love.

Clark acknowledges that in his unyielding quest for quality and equality there probably are inconsistencies, and even rigidities in some of his ideas. He comes to terms with these frailties through his own sense of humor, which, to him, is the leavening that reflects a perspective beyond narrow egocentric preoccupations.

Kenneth Clark is an involved social psychologist who believes that issues of justice and power are central in social-science research. He is a social psychologist who knows which side he is on.

Analytic Summary

The two most meaningful stages in the kinship system for Kenneth Clark were the periods (stages I and III) he spent in the family of orientation, which supported and sustained him through college and a portion of graduate school; and in the family of procreation, which took up almost where the family of orientation left off. Stage II, the transitional period of an independent ~~single person~~ householder, was of short duration. The dominant figure in his family of orientation was his mother. Clark calls his mother and his wife the key women in his life who have sustained and supported him. His marriage has been a stabilizing force in his life for more than four decades.

Such stability and loyalty are characteristics of other dimensions of Clark's life. Clark began teaching at City College of the City University of New York when he was 28 years old, and continued as a faculty member of the same institution for 33 years. He moved to New York with his family when he was 4 years old and has remained as a resident of New York City or the New York City greater metropolitan area for 63 years. There is something stable and steady about Kenneth Clark that has sustained an unusual career of scholarship, public affairs, and community service.

His educational career was completed without interruption. Graduating from high school at the age of 16 years and completing stage I and II in education, Clark had a head start on stages III and IV, college and graduate school. He breezed through these stages in six years, moving directly to the next stage after completing an earlier stage. His marriage, which is stage III in the kinship system, did not take place until after he completed college and had commenced stage IV in education, graduate school. He was halfway through graduate school when he married. It is interesting that marriage was postponed until he was deep into the graduate studies of stage IV, since Clark had known his wife-to-be since the college years of stage II.

Having married and completed his graduate education by the age of 26 years, Clark was ready to commence his professional career. He had a few false or tentative starts that did not work out to satisfaction. These must have been a bit unsettling and may have contributed to the length of his stay at City College, since he found it to be a supportive setting.

At the age of 28 years and following his appointment to City College as a psychology instructor, Clark's career unfolded through four stages of almost equal lengths ranging from 8 to 11 years. The 8 years in stage I was needed to accommodate Clark's community-service activities in addition to his teaching, researching, and writing. Indeed, there is some indication that the community service impeded scholarly writing, but only in a modest way. Stage II lasted for 9 years and involved teaching, research, writing, and public service. To this heavy commitment was added public affairs, which was a consuming responsibility until the U.S. Supreme Court rendered its 1954 decision on school desegregation. It was Clark's participation in the school-desegregation case that greatly enhanced his total career and propelled him into stage III, which consolidated skills developed earlier and accommodated new skills developed in administration. Stage III also was the period when some public honors were bestowed and responsibility for the leadership of a learned society was assumed. This stage began when Clark was 45 years old and extended over a decade in his life; it witnessed a tremendous increase in scholarly writings.

Stage IV was similar to the preceding stage, except that the public honors were more prestigious and the positions to which he was elevated involved more extensive responsibilities. So extensive were Clark's commitments before and into this stage that something had to give as he approached the sixth decade of his life. It was during this period that he reduced his teaching, taking early retirement at the age of 61 years; but he increased his community-service and administrative activities through the organization of a family consulting firm.

In summary, the career of Kenneth Clark has been one in which academic affairs and public affairs have complemented each other. Blending these two together so well has been one of his major contributions as a psychologist.

130

Chapter 7

Matthew Holden, Jr.

A Political Scientist Who Cares About the Ordinary

A distinguished political scientist who has focused on comparative politics and international relations, urban planning, and policy analysis, Matthew Holden, Jr. has been critical of the professionals in his field for not giving attention to domestic issues as well as foreign policy. Foreign-policy analysis is a long-standing tradition in political science, but not domestic-policy studies (Holden and Dresang, 1975:12). In an essay appropriately titled "On the Misunderstanding of Important Phenomena," Holden observed that "the tumults of Boston, Cincinnati, Dayton, St. Petersberg, and Tampa are pushed off Page One by the more dramatically dangerous confrontation of Jew and Arab ... But every sign is that they will yet return to the nation's consciousness." In a real sense, Holden said, one could call the domestic tumults "the most genuine type of maximum feasible participation of the poor ... or the ringing once more of Mr. Jefferson's fire bell" (Holden, 1968:111).

A Professional Policy-Maker

Political scientist Stuart Nagel of the University of Illinois has noted "a substantial change," a "new orientation" among political scientists "within the last few years." Political scientists are beginning to apply the scientific method to the study of problems that have broad significance on the domestic scene. Nagel attributes this change to many sources, including the civil-rights movement. In his judgment, "policy studies is the most rapidly developing field within political science" (Nagel, 1975:7-8).

Matthew Holden, Jr. is at the forefront in this new thrust among political scientists, as manifested by the themes examined in his publications and the nature of his public-service participation. Holden not only writes about the politics of bureaucracy and administration, he has had extensive personal experience in public-administration research and as a policy-making practitioner at federal, state, and local levels.

His practical experience in public-administration research dates back to the late 1950s, when Holden joined the staffs of the Cleveland Metropolitan Service Commission and the Cayahoga County Charter Commission. These local experiences in public-administration research were reinforced and refined later by appointments in state and federal government. In 1977, Holden received a presidential appointment as commissioner of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, United States Department of Energy. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is an updated version of the old Federal Power Commission that was formed in the 1920s. Holden has supplemented his experience of about a decade in public-administration research and public policy-making with about a decade and a half of work as a professor on university faculties. Matthew Holden, Jr., then, unites both the theoretical and the practical. He is a political scientist who has made a difference because of the legal authority behind his official actions and the logical and perceptive analyses presented in his published works.

That his peers had cast more votes for him than other political scientists in our survey of outstanding black professionals was a surprise to Holden, who believed that his serious scholarly writings were of "limited scope, substance, and depth." Holden's full-time function in recent years as a professional policy-maker has been in his words, "highly beneficial to me from an intellectual point of view." However, his reluctance to be counted among the outstanding is because he finds it hard to believe that his work measures up to the "truly remarkable academic writings" of scholars such as Ralph Bunche. Others, however, had a different view.

In our study, more scholars were nominated as outstanding in political science than in any of the other disciplines investigated. This fact probably indicates what Holden himself humorously called "the fratricidal (but non-lethal) war of the discipline," particularly the divisions between behavioral and normative political science (Holden, 1966:2). Because of the great division in the field, when we sought nominations of outstanding black political scientists, five received multiple nominations. This rather large panel (we anticipated that the number would be not greater than three) was submitted to a nationwide sample of 87 scientists, both black and white, of whom 68 participated in the study by ranking the panel members. A majority opinion was not expected, given the relatively large panel of nominees ranked by a relatively small sample. A decisive plurality of 21 political scientists of all races and in all regions of the country said that Matthew Holden, Jr. was the most outstanding. All others received fewer votes. The absence of overwhelming consensus by a majority concerning who is most outstanding among black political scientists reflects as much the discipline and the diversity of interests within it as the age of the scholars nominated. None had retired and finished his or her career.

Holden is a widely read scholar in many different social-science fields, including history, sociology, and anthropology. He has conducted several important investigations in the areas of policy studies, political decision-making, and urban planning, and has authored or edited several books, chapters in books, monographs, and journal articles.

Beyond the fact that better than a third of his career has been spent working full time in the application of principle to practice, Holden was surprised that a substantial number of his colleagues recognized his contributions because, in his words, "my work always seems to be moving in the other direction than the work of some in political science." He said that he refuses to be bound by the concepts in his field, and that he has never been excessively respectful of received doctrines of what the discipline is: "One has to go ahead and do what one genuinely wants to do."

What Holden has not realized is that his work has been ahead of rather than off to one side of his field. Holden has served on the council of the Policy Studies Organization. In 1975, Sage Publication brought out the first volume of its Year Book of Politics and Public Policy. Holden was the senior coeditor of that volume. And in 1972, Holden was chairman of the Section on Policy Analysis of the American Political Science Association. Thus, Holden was there at the creation of this renewed interest in policy analysis which, in his customary manner of understatement, he prefers to call "the revival of policy studies" (Holden and Dresang, 1975:10).

In general, Holden sees himself as an ordinary professional using ordinary experience to help him become more knowledgeable of the bargaining process in decision-making (Holden, 1966:44-45) and of the ways of achieving the twin goals of "social equalization" and "social peace" (Holden, 1971:64-65). For this reason, Holden makes a strong case for the "relevance of ordinary experience" as a guide for professional action. He asked this question of the scholars who might challenge him because of the known bias of perception and interpretation of ordinary experience: "[How many] would accurately predict their own behaviors as consultants, teachers, deans, etc. ... if they accepted only that evidence susceptible to the kind of verification demanded in much of the formal theory?" (Holden, 1966:6).

And while he is making the case for the use of ordinary experience in the analysis of public policy, he develops, in passing, a unique and out-of-the-ordinary idea -- that of urban statehood (Holden, 1971:70). It demonstrates the fertile mind of Matthew Holden, Jr. and his capacity to embrace bold concepts. Yet Holden would dismiss such praise as unwarranted because, in his words, "the idea has actually floated about in textbook form for many years" and simply has been neglected (Holden, 1971:71).

Holden's urban-statehood idea is a way of introducing cultural pluralism into the federal bureaucracy. When the number of blacks and other racial minorities in the decision-making structure constitutes a sufficiently large critical mass, federal officials will identify issues of racial relations as important and will develop strategic objectives and timetables to resolve them, said Holden, who believes that decentralization leads away from rather than toward black power. His idea is that any urban unit that has a population greater than Arizona, Alaska, or Hawaii can become a new state and can participate in the mainstream with an autonomous base of power. If a minimum arbitrary figure of 500,000 people were used, this would result in 21 additional states, to make a total of 71 United States. Probably 10 or more of the 21 new city-states would be more or less under black control. Such areas would not be electing merely mayors with limited power, according to Holden, but congressmen and senators. And "20 senators bound by a common interest and a common necessity are a bloc likely to carry great weight, which is precisely the purpose of the proposal" (Holden, 1971:70-71).

The urban-statehood proposal, as reported by Holden, was sketched because it is unusual and also because it illustrates the quality of Holden's mind in developing a political design. One can think clearly and daringly, as Holden does, only if one is without egocentric preoccupation. Holden is a humble man but not a mild-mannered man. Indeed, he is very assertive, as indicated by the announcement of his statehood proposal and as further discussion of his identification with others will reveal. Holden is an interesting combination of contrasting characteristics not unlike the contrasting communities in which he grew up in Mound Bayou, Mississippi and Chicago, Illinois.

Family Background

Childhood in Mound Bayou

Matthew Holden lived in Mound Bayou, Mississippi until he was 13 years old. Then his family moved to Chicago. He described Mound Bayou, an all-black town settled by ex-slaves from the Jefferson Davis plantation, as a place where there was great pride. One of the founders of the town survived until 1924, just seven years before Holden was born. Thus, Holden grew into early childhood years hearing stories about the early settlers. Holden said that Isaiah T. Montgomery, one of the founders, had two basic themes in his philosophy: "If you haven't got power yourself, keep powerful friends," and "The survival of black people depends on being able to do something on their own." Holden said that many people, both black and white, respected Isaiah Montgomery. According to Holden, Montgomery was a "tough-minded man" who also was "roundly denounced, with good reason, for having made the decision to support the Constitution of 1890 in Mississippi."

One of Holden's grandfathers was a preacher who served four different churches, visting one each month. He died when he was 53 years old. Before death he acccumulated in Amite County, Mississippi "a good deal of land, about 560 acres," according to Holden. The family worked the land, with Holden taking his turn in the field, chopping and picking cotton. Holden said, however, that his fieldwork always was after school hours.

Of his extended kinship system, including the Holdens, the Welch family (his maternal grandfather's people), and the Canedy-Clark tribe (his maternal grandmother's people), Holden said "there were several elements of my family that had seen, in the family mythology, better days. And, on all sides, we thought of ourselves as eminently substantial and respectable people." Holden said, there was "a sense of uprightness and of being somebody which went with owning a little piece of land or sometimes a sizable piece of land." Holden said, that sense of uprightness associated with ownership of property "was extremely important."

Holden's family insisted that he go to school. Illness was the only legitimate excuse for staying at home. His family never kept him out of school so that he could assist them in the field, not even at harvest time. Holden puts it this way: "My father was insistent that I, his son, go to school. There was great emphasis on education in my family. School was important to me and my family."

Holden's father completed five years of school and his mother completed the eleventh grade of high school. Their jobs when they left the farm were in service or laboring occupations and semiskilled work. Yet they wanted their offspring to achieve more. Going to college, said Holden, was as preordained as anything could be: "Do you eat when you get hungry? That is how preordained college was for me."

Holden was not the first in the family to go to college. Holden had an uncle (his father's brother) who every one said was smart. The family wanted him to be a doctor and sent him to Alcorn College in Mississippi, but the uncle died before finishing Alcorn. "The family had their hopes pinned on him." When Holden came along everyone thought he was very much like his uncle, Samuel. "This is how their hope and ambition centered on me."

Holden had two half brothers and grew up around many relatives. But in the household formed by the marriage of his mother and father he, in effect, was "an only child." The ambitions and unfulfilled wishes of his parents, especially his mother, centered on him too.

Holden describes his mother as "an extremely intelligent woman" who continues to read the newspaper and the Bible. All that Holden has written, she has gathered on a shelf in her residence. Holden said that he is not sure that she read it but she is proud of his work. His mother's ambition had been to graduate from high school and go to Rust College in Mississippi. A woman in the community offered to pay for her college expenses but her father would not accept the offer, not wishing to be obligated to the giver. Later, however, Holden said, his grandfather "confessed to his daughter" that he did her a great injustice by not letting her go to college.

The drought was severe. The crops failed. There was no alternative but to pull up stakes and seek opportunity elsewhere. It was 1944. Wartime production beckoned blacks to northern cities. His household went to Chicago, where his parents found work. Holden had passed his thirteenth birthday.

Adolescence and Young Adulthood in Chicago

It was in Chicago that Holden's interest in politics was awakened. "I hung around my father and uncle and listened to the ward committeeman as he talked to them. Instead of playing with the kids, I stood around and heard him discuss politics. Sitting around ward headquarters in Chicago, I heard things. I was young and no threat, so the ward committeeman, William Dawson, talked with me. He was an extraordinary person, a man of *realpolitik*, a supreme pragmatist, a genius." Even to this day Holden greatly respects Congressman William Dawson. "He was a good platform orator and a rough back-alley fighter."

In a self-description of his manner, Holden indicates that some of the rough-and-tumble of Chicago precinct politics and the determination of an all-black farming community in Mississippi have remained with him. "I have always been probably a little more assertive than most people. But when I was a teenager, I was subject to as many doubts as anyone. I could walk by a door four times when looking for a job before I had enough courage to open the door and go in." Despite the doubts, "I also believe that you should go after the chance." For example, "Once someone tells you that you can't do something, then that is what you have to do." Because of this philosophy of life, "I doubt that I had mentors. There were people who influenced me. One, in particular, was Norton Long. The man's mind is a field of electricity; it was he, more than anyone else, whom I sought to emulate in maintaining knowledge and interests across a wide area and to relate things across a wide area. St. Clair Drake -- a smart and kind [redacted] person of great integrity -- was another profound source of influence as was Melville Herskovits and, at far distance, Judge William Hastie and the mythology of Grandfather William Holden, a mover and shaker."

One person Holden could always count on was his mother, who nurtured him through the doubting years of adolescence and provided a safe and secure shelter to which he could return after his probes into the outside world. Holden's mother and father eventually separated after they moved to Chicago. Holden remained as a member of his mother's household until he received a master's degree and was drafted into the U.S. army.

Thereafter he would spend time in the army and in Cleveland, Evanston, and Detroit pursuing graduate study and work. During this period, which lasted eight years, he was an independent [redacted] householder until he married Dorothy Amanda Howard when he was 32 years old. They have two children.

Education

College

Holden attended two different colleges, the University of Chicago and then Roosevelt University, from which he received his bachelor's degree.

At the age of 16 years he enrolled in the University of Chicago and remained there off and on for about four years, but he made little progress toward completing a degree. In 1946 the University of Chicago was experimenting with various methods of instruction. There were numerous options and few external limits imposed by the institution. One experiment was elimination of the requirement of students to attend classes. Holden experienced the University of Chicago as a learning environment of two extremes -- "a combination of freedom and rigid structure." All this affected his grades in a negative way, and eventually he withdrew. Holden described his University of Chicago experience as "truly great and beneficial." There, he learned a great deal "including an attitude about learning." Nevertheless, he "flunked out" because, in his words, "I was unable to muster the self-discipline to cope with both the intellectual opportunity and the intellectual freedom, as well as to overcome my own timidity."

Roosevelt University in Chicago was a good setting for Holden after he left the University of Chicago. When he attended college, "there were no special privileges for me." Holden attended Roosevelt two years, from 1950 to 1952. He enrolled in school wanting to go into law. He majored in political science and took a minor in history. At the time of his graduation, however, he realized that his entire undergraduate record was not good enough to get him admitted to the kind of law school he wanted to attend. So he decided to pursue graduate study in political science. Holden's decision to go into political science also can be interpreted as an extension of his childhood experiences and conversations with the ward committeeman and the interest in political matters they awakened in him.

Graduate School

Despite his stop-and-go performance in college, Holden completed his undergraduate education the year in which he turned 21 years old. The next year he enrolled in Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois, a suburb of Chicago. He obtained his master's degree in political science two years later.

With the first level of graduate education behind him, Holden's plan was to join the Foreign Service and become a career officer. He crammed for the examination, passed it, and became a candidate. He was then called into military service for two years when he was 24 years old. The Foreign Service deferred final decision on his appointment, since he had not passed the language examination.

Getting out of the army, where he attained the rank of sergeant, Holden decided to continue his political-science studies. However, he needed money to do this, so he decided to take a job to finance the last phase of his graduate education. At this point in his life, Holden was on his own, with limited funds and no sponsorship. He was making things happen, going after the chance. He took the public-administration examination, passed it, and secured jobs first with the Cleveland Metropolitan Commission and then with the Charter Commission in Cuyahoga County.

Holden came back to Northwestern University in 1958 and three years later obtained his Ph.D. degree at the age of 29 years. Even with the many interruptions mentioned Holden was able to complete his graduate studies 9 years after receipt of his bachelor's degree. He supported himself during this period by working at the Charter Commission, teaching in the evening division of Northwestern University, and working as a research assistant at the University of Illinois, Institute of Government and Public Affairs. The advice that Holden often gives to others, he accepted for himself during this period in his life. He believes that "one has to invest a good deal of oneself and one's own resources in one's professional development and not rely soley on resources that come by subsidy." Holden did precisely this. He crammed a great deal of activity and effort into three short years and was ready to commence his career as a scholar in 1961.

Career

Stage I

Holden interrupted his graduate studies once for military service and again for full-time employment. Fortunately, his work was in an applied area of his professional interest.

From 1957 through 1959, Holden was on the staffs of the Cleveland Metropolitan Service Commission and the Cuyahoga Charter Commission as research assistant and staff consultant, respectively. While these were entry-level appointments, they provided enormous pragmatic experiences that sparked Holden's theoretical interest in urban politics and gave him insight into cities. These jobs appropriately should be classified as stage I in Holden's career. They provided practical experience in urban planning and opportunities to get experience in research and writing. Holden prepared two important monographs during this period, *County Government in Ohio* (1958a) and *Intergovernmental Agreements in the Cleveland Metropolitan Area* (1958b). Stage I lasted a total of four years.

Stage II

Upon receipt of the Ph.D. degree, Holden was appointed instructor and later assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Michigan's Wayne State University in 1961. This appointment began stage II in Holden's professional career, which extended over a period of eight years and included an appointment at the University of Pittsburgh beginning in 1963. Holden was 29 years old when he obtained his first full-time teaching appointment.

Holden had always wanted to be a professor. He had reached the conclusion that "a college professor was an occupation with the least racial impedimenta." In his longstanding practice of seizing the chance, Holden decided to become a college professor and to secure the necessary credentials. Holden was appointed to a university faculty during the summer session of 1960. He had to work hard to catch up since stage I had not involved full-time teaching. During this period, he taught both at Wayne State University and at the University of Pittsburgh, did research, and began a distinguished career of writing for learned journals.

No books were written during stage II. But 11 articles and monographs on a range of subjects were published -- an average of more than one a year for the entire period. One of his favorite articles, published in 1963, the year he moved to Pittsburgh for a duration of three years, was entitled "Litigation and the Political Order." It appeared in the Western Political Quarterly (Holden, 1963) and discusses litigation as a form of social combat, insurrection without arms.

Holden served as a consultant to Resources for the Future the summers of 1965 and 1966. Utilizing these experiences, he prepared a magnificent essay on regulatory decision-making that established him as a major theoretician on the politics of decision-making. The particular theme of the essay had to do with pollution control. Holden took a major public-policy problem and demonstrated how analysis of it was one of the most important ways for determing what the deficiencies of decision-making analysis are (Holden, 1966:4).

During this stage in his career, Holden put into operation the advice he received from Norton Long in graduate school. He was taking particular problems and finding common principles within them. This approach to political science, he said, helped him "to see general principles in particular knowledge ... of international relations and cities and helped ... to overcome compartmentalization." Holden was at his best implementing this approach in the review essays that he prepared for professional journals. He could take a half-dozen different books on a common topic such as law enforcement or race relations, find common principles running through them, and present a critique of the books individually and collectively that in the end would contribute to politial-science theory.

A general deficiency of social scientists that he found and reported in one of his essays entitled "Judgment and the Right Questions" is that "they tend to be afflicted with a parochialism of time." They fail to recognize the meaning of change -- "that the parameters within which capacity is to be measured are different, for the same population, from one time to another" (Holden, 1966:117).

Holden states that "the most important problems in social science, in this generation, still are problems of discovery, rather than problems of verification." He believes that verification is crucial, but that it is with respect to discovery "that we still have important problems with which to deal." Holden states that this is his orientation probably because his "intellectual foundations owe more to Aristotle, the Old Testament, and Hobbs than to the Enlightenment and Marx."

Holden's reputation was growing. He was becoming known in the field by his writings and by his participation in numerous symposia. By the time stage II had come to the end, Holden had caught up with some and gone ahead of others in his writing. During this period he published in such prestigious journals as *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, *Western Political Quarterly*, *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, and *American Political Science Review*. During the eight-year period of stage II, Holden established himself as a serious scholar.

Stage III

Stage III in his career began when Holden was 38 years old. In 1969 the University of Wisconsin at Madison invited him to join its faculty as a full professor in the Department of Political Science. For years this department has ranked among the top 10 in political science in the nation. The same year that Holden moved to Wisconsin, he was elected to the Board of Directors of the Social Science Research Council. Later he would accept appointment as a member of the Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences of the National Academy of Science. These appointments indicate the respect with which he was held by his peers.

Holden served as an elected member of the Council of the American Political Science Association from 1972 and 1974 and as Chairman of its Section on Policy Analysis the first year of his term on the Council. In 1973 he served a term as Council member of the Policy Studies Organization. And in 1976-77 he was elected vice-president of the American Political Science Association. Meanwhile, he worked with the regional organization, the Midwest Political Science Association, and was an active participant in the local Wisconsin Capital Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration. When asked how the career of other blacks in political science might be enhanced, Holden said, "One has to be willing to invest the time and effort to participate in the full range of the activities of the scholars of the discipline and not withdraw from them." Holden would recommend such an approach for those who wish to become involved. It has worked for him and he predicts that it will work for others. Holden has moved toward the front of his discipline by assuming responsibilities of service in its associations.

Meanwhile his other contributions to political science and public policy-making have escalated. Holden authored and edited six books during this period and increased his participation in public affairs. He served on the Governor's Committee on Metropolitan Area Problems in Wisconsin, and as consultant to several federal agencies such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development and member of the Air Quality Advisory Board.

Most of all, Holden increased his policy-making skills during the third stage of his political-science career. In 1975 he left the university to become commissioner of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. Two years later, he came to Washington, D.C. to be sworn in as Commissioner of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Stage III of Holden's career has been fruitful. Thus far it has embraced a dozen years. During this period, which began in 1969, he has refined his teaching skills, continued his research, increased his writing, participated in public and professional affairs, and developed new skills at state and national levels in public policy-making. Holden will close out stage III in his career when his term as federal commissioner expires. It does not yet appear which direction stage IV will take as he approaches the midcentury point of his life.

Personal Characteristics

Holden is assertive, blunt, honest, and shy. These characteristics are all rolled up together in a person who is at once skeptical and kind. He is energetic and the possessor of enormous talent. Once Holden takes a stand there is no confusion about what it is. He is direct and decisive in the articulation of his views. He is respectful of people, kind in evaluating their professional work, always fair in his criticism. He may question or even denounce ideas but never the indivdual who utters or writes these ideas.

Because he has followed a philosophy of life of self-direction and professional competitiveness, Holden has said that personally he has not experienced racial discrimination in his academic career in a form and to an extent that was decisive, except perhaps when he began to entertain thoughts of opportunities for the administrative side of his career. In other words, Holden said, "I don't have a perception of having been seriously impeded by being Black, and in some ways being Black may have given me an extra vision." From this perspective, he said, "Maybe being Black was even a practical asset."

Concerning his assertiveness, he said that he had to make it clear that no one has a right to exclude him. As an example, "I made an issue out of living in the rooming houses near the Northwestern campus when no blacks lived in the houses because I would not accept the concept that others had a right to exclude me."

The real issue, said Holden, especially for black professional political scientists, is to find ways of incorporating discomfort and adversity into focused activity. He states that "one must confront issues of survival in a world of power on the predicate that the world will not cease to be a world of power but that justice is likely to be lasting when it is achieved and enforced with knowledge of the use of power." Finally he said (in his characteristic way of imparting extraordinary wisdom as if it were ordinary folklore), "the presence or absence of knowledge of how to deal with power will determine whether or not the world will drive you up the wall."

Analytic Summary

The summary of the career of Matthew Holden, Jr. will demonstrate linkages between family, education, and work. Of particular interest are the various stages in each of these processes, the events that interconnect a stage within a system and those that interrelate different systems to each other.

Holden, indeed, had not just a family but an extended kinship system in early childhood in Mississippi. There were plenty of aunts, uncles, counsins, and grandparents. A farming family of limited means never had enough resources to give similar opportunities to every member. Thus, there was a tendency to pin hope on the family member who was believed to be smart, and to rally around and support the forward movement of that individual by way of providing more schooling. Family members sublimated the fulfillment of their personal ambitions through the achievement of the chosen one. In his early years, Holden was identified by his family as the smart one. He was like his uncle, who died before completing college and becoming a doctor as the family hoped he would. Holden's kinship system and his family of orientation nurtured and sustained him through childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood. He remained a member of his mother's household until he received a master's degree.

Despite some difficulties in diligently applying himself to his studies in college during the late adolescent period, Holden's family of orientation never gave up on him. His parents supported him through six years of formal study in college and involved him in informal learning experiences such as the trips he made with his father and uncle to the office of the ward committeeman. Regardless of how difficult the problems that were before him, Holden always knew he had the support of his family of orientation behind him. And this made a difference.

Following a two-year stint in military service, Holden had to make it more or less on his own. His parents were blue-collar workers with limited education who found employment in laboring, service, or semi-skilled occupations. There was bread enough in his mother's household, but not much of anything else to share.

So that he might work and study, and study and work, and still complete the stage of graduate education by the age of 30 years (despite the interruption of military service), Holden shuttled back and forth between entry-level jobs in public administration and school, holding some of these jobs coterminously with graduate-school matriculation.

Holden was able to do this because he was without family obligations. He remained an independent householder eight years. He was two years into the second stage of his career before he married at the age of 32 years. It appears that Holden waited until he achieved the occupation of his choice before taking on the responsibilities of stage III in the kinship system -- the family of procreation. At the time of this study Matthew and Dorothy Holden had been married 18 years.

With reference to education, clearly the hope and aspiration that Holden's family had for him must have had a motivating effect. His struggles to get an education were his own but they also were for a family who in part fulfilled their own ambitions through his success. He breezed through the early stages of his education and graduated from high school at the age of 16 years.

Holden may have been ready for college, but not for the first college in which he enrolled. Although he spent six years in college rather than the customary four, it should be noted that Holden did not drop out. Too many had their hopes and ambitions pinned on him to stop because of a few difficulties encountered. Although he entered the college stage of his career in midadolescence, Holden did not complete his graduate education until the age of 29 years. This fact has two implications -- one, that those who start early do not always end early; and two, that a later ending of one's education does not necessarily hamper an effective beginning of a professional career. Perhaps one may have to cram more activities into one stage of a career that could have been better distributed among all stages. One can call the overloading in one stage in one system because of the excessive length of a development stage in another system a form of compensation.

One way that Holden compensated for the extended state of graduate education, and the need to begin his career not in his chosen occupation before the completion of graduate school, was to remain single for an extended period. The period of an independent householder, which often is a transition period of short duration, was an eight-year stage in Holden's life. This period gave him the flexibility to accommodate career and education objectives until they could be brought into harmony with each other.

Throughout all the stages and within all the systems one sees major events that affected the course of Holden's life: the move to Chicago in the family system, the interruption of his education by military service, his move to the University of Wisconsin. These and other events linked family, education, and career, and the various stages within each system.

The unfolding events in Holden's life is an interesting mixture of both seizing the chance and waiting upon the opportunity.

Chapter 8

Darwin T. T. Turner

An Objective and Sympathetic Literary Critic

Darwin Theodore Troy Turner. The alliterative character of his name is indicative of the artistic signs and symbols that have surrounded him since the beginning. He was born in Cincinnati, Ohio in 1931 during the depths of the Depression. Some have called the city of his birth the gateway to the North; others have dubbed it the northernmost southern city. The setting of his childhood and youth, then, was a place betwixt and between.

Literature and the Black Experience

If art flourishes when science falters, Turner was born at a time when art was needed for hope, for the science-based economy of American society had crumbled. Beyond being born at a dismal time in the nation's history, Turner's childhood was a period when our nation also was at war. Any person, and particularly a sensitive young person, would want to know the meaning of this. The art of words was Turner's vehicle for making sense out of the world, its people, and his place in life. As stated by Jean Toomer, "art is devoted to life" (Turner, 1971a:124). Turner has dedicated himself to understanding the art of writing and consequently the substance of life.

All words and combinations of words have interested Turner over the years. Essays, fiction, poetry, and drama have attracted his critical concern (Turner, 1970). His role as a critic has been outstanding because he strives to be objective. Turner is a critic who writes objectively about black authors because that is the group with which he is most familiar (Turner, 1968:690). He writes about black authors as a way of "helping to recall some from semioblivion" (Moore, 1971:ix). Finally, Turner writes about black authors as a way of understanding the United States. "As Americans," he said, "they respond to issues which touch all Americans" (Turner, 1968:687). Reflecting his range of interest in humanity, Turner writes about white authors, also.

Turner sees the American experience manifested in the black experience. Others have come to this conclusion. In his book *Black Fiction* Roger Rosenblatt said, "themes which have been ascribed as characteristically American ... are the themes of black fiction as well ... the problem of national self-definition which has regularly dominated American writers is at the heart of black fiction." American literary conventions, Rosenblatt said, have provided black writers "something to lean on and push against at the same time" (Rosenblatt, 1974:4-5). Corroborating this idea, Turner said this of black essayists: "[they] came of age, then rejected the age." But "their ideas have meaning for American readers" (Turner, 1970:8).

Turner has had a fruitful career appraising the works of black and of other scholars. In the words of Harry Moore of Southern Illinois University, Darwin Turner presents an "indepth ... sympathetic analysis," "a fuller comprehension," with the "gifts of understanding" (Moore, 1971:ix-x). His appraisals also are objective and honest. J. Corene Elam called Turner's assessments "meticulous" and "concise." As a scholar, Elam said, Turner is a trail-blazer, especially in the way he handled materials that fully reintroduced Jean Toomer to the American reading public. Darwin Turner is at his best in analyzing the intellectual and psychological development of authors (Elam, 1981:56).

Turner has written excellent scholarly appraisals of the work of others but has not produced a large artistic work of his own other than a volume of poetry, a major creative work (Turner, 1964).

As far back as the college years, Turner always has had dual concerns that seem to compete with each other, blurring the focus of his career. These dual concerns and the energy required to resolve them may have affected his creative thrust. He enrolled in the University of Cincinnati when only 13 years old. Rather than lengthening the period of early study for the purpose of discovering vocational interests, as he could have without adversely affecting his future, Turner shortened his college career. He graduated in three rather than the customary four years. Turner's undergraduate major was English, but he seriously considered mathematics; yet he always wanted to be an actor. Turner applied to several law schools for postgraduate study, but accepted a scholarship to enroll in a master's-degree program in English. He had no intention of teaching, but his first job was in education and so have been subsequent and current appointments. Immediately after receiving his first-level graduate degree, Turner got married and found a job, although his family and particularly his grandmother preferred that he go on then and earn a doctoral degree. After two years of teaching, Turner resigned his first job and went to Chicago and enrolled in the University of Chicago to study for the highest academic degree.

Turner has always been interested in research and writing. His first short story was published while still a graduate student, although a full-time teacher. However, for about two decades, his career in higher education was split with joint responsibilities in administration, on the one hand, and teaching and research on the other. In the area of ideas, Turner also exhibits contrasting themes that could conflict with each other.

With these contradictions to overcome, it is remarkable that Turner has made such extensive contributions. During a 32-year career that began in 1949, he has authored or edited approximately 17 books and 48 articles, averaging more than one article a year and one book every two years. He has critically appraised the work of both black and white authors. Currently he is in charge of the Afro-American Studies Program at the University of Iowa in Iowa City and also University of Iowa Foundation Distinguished Professor of English. The English Department at that university has ranked consistently among the top third of all English departments in the nation.

Turner has been not only a creative critic, he has developed the tools of his trade and shared them with others so that they might pursue their work with greater ease. Seldom does one get honored for doing the support work for a discipline. Turner has undertaken such a responsibility and has published A Guide to Composition (1960), Standards for Freshman Composition (1961), Afro-American Writers: A Bibliography (1970), and Syllabus for Afro-American Literature (1981). He did all this while authoring or editing scholarly books and writing articles for learned journals. Moreover, he has been a good citizen of his discipline and has served as president of one of its learned associations and on several committees of professional organizations. All this has been accomplished during three stages of Turner's career. The final stage has yet to commence.

Family Background

Turner's intellectual gifts flow naturally from his family. His sense of worthiness and esteem were nurtured by them. One of his books is dedicated "To my Grandmother who was proud and to Mother and Dad who are." This dedicatory page indicates the nature of the context out of which he came.

Turner's paternal grandfather was a college teacher and the principal of a public school. He had a long career in education and was honored by the St. Louis public-school system, which named a building after him. Turner remarked, "everyone says I'm like my grandfather." His grandfather was the first black male to graduate from the University of Cincinnati, where he earned a Ph.D. in biology. He was a prolific writer and was an editor. He specialized in the study of ants and bees. Turner said his grandfather was "a great inspiration" to him.

On his mother's side of the family, Turner described his grandmother as "the driving force ... she was a determined woman." His grandmother, he said, "valued people according to their intellect." She came from a line of educators. Her grandfather, Owen Nickens, (Turner's maternal great-grandfather) was one of the first black teachers in Cincinnati. According to Turner, he founded the first successful school for blacks in that city. Turner's grandmother obtained the master's degree the same year that her daughter, Turner's mother, received a graduate degree. His mother was the youngest graduate in the history of the University of Cincinnati at the time she received her baccalaureate degree; she was 18 years old. She received both a Bachelor of Arts and a Bachelor of Science in Education degree and obtained a Master of Arts degree in English as well as a Master of Science in Education degree. Turner's mother was an English teacher in the public-school system.

Turner's father studied chemistry and took graduate courses at the University of Cincinnati but did not finish his dissertation because he feared that a Ph.D. would persuade him to teach. After working as a research chemist, he studied pharmacy at the University of Illinois and received a bachelor's degree in that field.

For business reasons, Turner's father preferred Chicago, where he operated three drugstores. At first his mother moved there but later she returned to Cincinnati, which she preferred. However, she would go back to Chicago often to visit with her husband. There were two children in Turner's family of orientation -- Darwin and a younger brother, Charles, who eventually graduated from Harvard. The children remained in Cincinnati with their mother and her extended family.

Education

Turner said, "In my family, it was assumed that we would go to college if we wanted to. The money was available and the tradition was there." Before college, however, there was public-school education, which Turner moved through with dispatch. He was considered by many to be a prodigy. A study of black precocious children was undertaken by the president of a black college a few decades ago. Darwin Turner was in that study. He entered public school when he was 4 years old.

Turner enjoyed school at all levels. In high school he tended to associate with older students, feeling that his age mates were too young.

In college, he said, "I did the usual things that other students did: I could play poker, pool, Ping Pong; I spent hours seeing movies and playing bridge."

Turner's mother and grandmother encouraged him in elementary school. They doted on him. He was the first new child in the family in 22 years. Much of his education in the home during his younger years, however, was provided by an older couple and an aunt-in-law who babysat with him. Turner said, "Although I did very well in the seventh and eighth grades, I had trouble in the ninth grade when I transferred to the city's top academic high school, the one that students entered only as a result of scores on standardized tests." Turner's family hired a tutor to help him with ninth grade algebra. In general, however, Turner said, "The family left me alone rather than harassing me about studies."

He acknowledges that his family offered incentives at times. For example, his grandmother offered him a dollar for every A he got when he first enrolled in college. Even before he entered college, his mother promised him a blue buick convertible if he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. Amused by these promises, Turner recalled that he got all As the first term and later made Phi Beta Kappa, but never got the dollars or the buick until he bought one himself in later life. There were several news stories about Turner's extraordinary mental ability. As much as he could, Turner said that he tried to ignore all the hoopla.

Primary and Secondary School Education

Turner enrolled in school when he was 4 years old and spent a year in the first grade. On the recommendation of his teacher, he was skipped to the third grade. When he was 6, he entered the fourth grade, took a test, and was promoted to the sixth grade in midyear. A news story about Turner at that time, that his wife has preserved in a scrapbook, stated that he had the mental capacity of an 11-year old when he was only 6. He finished all the years normally required of high-school students. He did not skip any grades at the secondary level. However, he graduated from high school at the age of 13 years because of his head start in elementary school and the number of grades that he skipped.

College and Graduate School

Other members of Turner's family had attended the University of Cincinnati so that is where he enrolled. He entered college at the age of 13 years, was elected to Phi Beta Kappa at 15, and received his B.A. at 16, M.A. at 18, and Ph.D. at 25. His doctorate was earned at the University of Chicago. All other higher-education degrees were received from Cincinnati.

In 1944, when he entered college, he found that people at the University of Cincinnati did not understand the black experience; but, he said, "I didn't worry about it when I was in college. I did the usual things and enjoyed my years at the University of Cincinnati." At the time he said, "I didn't understand the black experience myself. I had led a sheltered, fortunate life -- only occasionally experiencing the discrimination that harasses many young Blacks."

Turner said that when he was young he saw Paul Robeson perform in Othello. Later Robeson became for him the image of a perfect man -- an athlete, actor, and Phi Beta Kappa. After personally assessing the problems that blacks encountered in getting jobs in drama in those days, Turner said he decided against drama as a major, although he still wanted to be an actor when he was a college senior. Turner said a white director of drama at the University of Cincinnati offered to help get acting lessons for him if he wanted them. Even this staff member of the University who offered assistance, according to Turner, "questioned why any very intelligent person would want to be an actor." Turner said, "Looking back now, I doubt that I would have, because of limited opportunities." At any rate, by the time he received his M.A. degree, Turner said he had other more pressing interests. "I wanted to get married."

Turner's choice of English was precipitated by an advisor. Midway through his second year in college, his advisor told him that, because of the number of credits he had taken in the freshman year, the summer, and the fall term, he would be a junior at the beginning of the spring semester; therefore, he needed to choose a major. Turner said he continued to vascillate between mathematics and English in the short period when he was trying to decide. He also thought about majoring in astronomy. English won. "I grew up with the Harvard Classics in our library at home. The works of Dickens were around. My mother had been in English. She was a teacher and my grandmother was a principal. Although I had no intention of teaching, I chose English when my advisor pushed me to pick a major."

Turner does not remember applying to the University of Cincinnati for graduate study in English. He does recall that upon completion of his undergraduate studies, he was offered a scholarship if he would agree to spend at least two years studying for an M.A. degree in English. Turner applied to law school at Harvard, Yale, and Columbia and was accepted at Columbia. But when he received the scholarship from the University of Cincinnati, he decided to accept it. He still planned to go to law school but knew that, even after the three-year program, he would only be 21, the minimum age for the bar.

At the age of 18 years, Turner emerged with a master's degree in English. His grandmother wanted him to go on for the Ph.D. degree then, but Turner made the decision to terminate his studies. "From a fairly early age, I was exercising an independence. I knew that decisions were going to be my own."

At that time, Turner's decision was to get married and to get a job. He took a job on the faculty of Clark College in Atlanta, Georgia, the school in which his paternal grandfather taught years ago. After two years of college teaching, Turner now had family responsibilities, including a wife and a child. Because he had no job for the summer, he decided to go to Chicago, get a job with his father's assistance, and take a course in Creative Writing as a special student at the University of Chicago. He applied as a special student because, since the University of Cincinnati had rejected him as too young for doctoral study, he assumed that the University of Chicago would do the same. At registration time, Napier Wilt, who would be his advisor, informed him that he had been accepted as a regular student and encouraged him to take courses in the doctoral program in English. In the fall he moved his family to Chicago.

Turner then discovered that he could work 40 hours per week (10 in his father's drugstore and 30 at the Quadrangle Club as a waiter) and study for the Ph.D. at the University of Chicago. Although working and studying, Turner earned as much money in Chicago as he made working full time at Clark College. This he did and completed requirements for the doctoral degree in one academic year and three or four summers of residence.

The degree was awarded in 1956 when Turner was 25 years old. Turner interrupted his doctoral work after one full year of studying to accept a faculty position at Morgan State College, a predominantly black school in Maryland.

Career

Stage I

As mentioned earlier, Turner's career began in 1949 when he was 18 years old, 7 years before he obtained the Ph.D. degree but immediately after the M.A. degree was awarded. That year, three major events occurred in Turner's life. He obtained a graduate degree, a wife, and his first full-time job. This is how Turner launched stage I in his career.

The first stage extended over an 8-year period and included employment at two predominantly black schools in the South -- Clark College in Atlanta, Georgia and Morgan State College (later renamed Morgan State University) in Baltimore, Maryland. This stage in career development was interrupted by a year and three or four summers of graduate study.

Turner had a heavy teaching schedule and was engaged in extensive research for his dissertation, which was a study of American nonrepresentational drama between 1920 and 1930. His creative output during this period involved quite a bit of poetry, a little fiction, and two television scripts; few of these creative works were published, maybe one short story. Turner said that he wrote his dissertation while teaching four English composition courses and one course in literature. Turner recalls that the president of Morgan State emphasized two things for his faculty -- obtaining the doctorate and publishing. The emphasis on publishing was an encouragement to Turner although he was unable to fulfill this interest during stage I. Turner remained at Morgan State five years, rising from instructor to assistant professor.

Stage II

After receipt of his Ph.D. degree, Turner was offered a job at Florida A. and M. University, a predominantly black state-supported institution. He was appointed professor and chairman of the Department of English. His move to Florida began stage II in his career, which extended over a period of 11 years.

During this stage Turner made up for the publishing deficits of the first stage. Between the ages of 26 and 38 years his career as a scholar began to bloom. He authored two books, one a volume of poetry in 1964 and the other, a study of The Scarlet Letter by Hawthorne in 1967. His co-edited book, Images of the Negro in America, was published by D. C. Heath in 1965. To this day, he describes the work on that book and its publication as "a very exciting experience" and often characterizes it as really "his first book." Also he completed articles on several black writers for Encyclopedia International and Encyclopedia Britannica. From 1965 on hardly a year passed that he was not asked to review a book for a scholarly publication such as the College Language Association Journal or The Journal of Negro History. His 1965 book launched him as a serious scholar recognized by his peers. Toward the last half of the 1960s decade, his career was coming into full bloom, after a slow start in stage I and the early years of stage II. Because of his administrative duties as department chairman, Turner said that he pushed his scholarly career ahead. "I always had the idea that the head of a department ought to publish too as a way of giving academic leadership to his faculty." Turner definitely gave such leadership during the years that he served as head of the English Department at A and T State University in Greensboro.

Turner described the force that kept his scholarship alive as "strictly internal." He was not caught up in any publish-or-perish syndrome. Even serving as a dean at the North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University from 1966 to 1970 -- his third academic appointment to a predominantly black school -- Turner described that role as a 9-to-5 job. "Then I would come home," he said "and work on scholarship." He identified his publishing goal as that of educating a larger public than he could educate in a class. While in a cavalier manner he said, "I regard most of my writing as a job," clearly writing had become a mission for him, a mission "to explain new ideas, introduce new authors." Again attempting to deny the deep respect that he had for the contributions of humanists like himself, Turner attributed his writing, in part, to vanity. Such off-handed attribution is inconsistent with the seriousness with which Turner approaches his tasks. Sprinkled throughout his writings are the words honesty and objectivity. These words characterize the man and his work. Perhaps Turner is one who has been successful in the apprehension of others but less successful in the apperception of himself — not an uncommon characteristic in scholars.

Darwin Turner has given leadership as a scholar in a range of areas. His published works during the second stage of his career included original poems and analyses of fiction and drama that were created by both black and white scholars.

Indeed, Turner's earlier research was about American drama and Shakespeare. He studied both black and white artists and researched American and non-American writers because, in his words, "I didn't want to be one locked into the category of writing only about black subjects." His volume on Hawthorne, review of Edna Ferber's book Ice Palace, and articles on the British playwrights Shakespeare, Osborne, and Auden attest to the range of his interests during stage II in his career.

Stage III

The third stage in Turner's career came soon after his second marriage, to Jeanne Turner, whom he describes as a "thoughtful" and "encouraging" person, (Turner, 1971d:xiv), one who has the capacity to endure. Professionally an elementary-school teacher, she both "revived" and "sustained" him at critical stages of his research and writing; for such nurturance, Turner is grateful.

Coterminous with his new marriage, the spiral in his career that moved him toward increasing administrative responsibility from department chairman to dean of a graduate school seemed to have broken. And with that break, stage III in his career began. The first three years were devoted wholly to scholarship -- teaching, research, and writing. Turner actually planned to teach approximately five years in a large university then return to administration. However, as he states it, "circumstances have worked otherwise." For the first time in a decade, Turner was able to focus his concerns and concentrate and refine his skills in research and writing, although he feels, at times, that he did more while department head and dean than since. And while his current appointment at the University of Iowa involves some administrative duties, Turner feels that he was selected because of his research and writing.

Although not wishing to be locked in black literature, Turner states that he enjoys it. Since his reputation in part is based on the work he has done in this field, he feels a responsibility to teach such courses. However, he continues to remind himself and others that his field is literature, "not just black literature." To do this, 1 of 4 courses that he teaches each year is a nonblack course in the English Department -- for example, something in drama.

At this stage in Turner's career, his publications tend to emphasize the black experience because there is a need for more complete and objective studies of the works of black writers (Turner, 1971:xxii), "black writers ... [are] in the vanguard of an artistic revolt" (Turner, 1970:163), and because he is "requested to prepare more materials for publication now" on the black experience.

Turner's personal and professional interest in black literature predates the current surge in public interest that began as the 1970 decade opened. His M.A. thesis written in 1949 was on black writers. He taught about black writers in his courses at Clark, Florida A and M and North Carolina A and T. Moreover, he presented papers on black writers at some professional association meetings during the years of stages I and II in his career.

Thus, the focus on black writers during stage III in his career is not so much due to a new and special interest of Turner as it is due to a new understanding in the society. Turner said that "from 1968 or 1969 to 1978 or so professional societies and publishers cried for something in black literature. Therefore, what went unpublished before, got published." For example, Turner said, "In 1965, I offered to deliver a paper on Jean Toomer to the South Atlantic Modern Language Association but was turned down. In 1969, the same group asked me to present whatever I wanted about black literature. In the 1970s the invitations to do things in black literature came so often that everything else was obscured."

Regarding the invitation to prepare materials for publication, Turner said that he experienced a dramatic increase when he moved from southern settings in predominantly black schools to predominantly white schools in the North. He noted that publishers' representatives come around the latter campuses and ask teachers what they are writing, but "publishers do not ask black scholars at black schools to prepare books. They look upon them as consumers of books." Turner, of course, views this practice as a form of discrimination. Of himself, he said, "I am no brighter than I was at the black schools." But as he moved North in 1969 to continue his career at the University of Wisconsin, the University of Michigan, and the University of Iowa and to begin stage III of his career, he received more and more invitations from more and more publishers to write.

In a single year, 1969, Turner published three edited volumes on Black American Literature with Charles Merrill and Company in Columbus, Ohio. One included essays, another, fiction; and a third, poetry. Adding a section on drama, these volumes were reissued as a single book the following year. Then in 1971, he published an anthology of black drama (Turner, 1971b) and his book about three Afro-American writers and their search for identity (Turner, 1971a). Two books followed in 1972 -- Voices from the Black Experience: African and Afro-American Literature (Turner, 1972a), and The Teaching of Literature by Afro-American Writers (Turner, 1972b). Some of these works were completed while Turner was in North Carolina where his reputation began to grow during stage II.

Between 1969 and 1972, the first few years of stage III, Turner's creativity literally exploded. Freed of administrative responsibilities and encouraged by a new marriage, his was an experience of unbridled creativity for a while. Not only did he edit or author an average of two books every year as the 1970s began, he prepared chapters on black authors, black colleges, and Black Studies for approximately eight books, wrote introductions to eight others (four books by black authors reissued by Arno Press and also books by or about blacks published by Collier, Merrill, Harper, and Lorrimer). Also during this period he reviewed 5 books by or about blacks for popular and professional magazines and published 9 articles in scholarly journals.

The early years of the third stage in Turner's career as he was coming upon and passing through his fortieth birthday were brilliant, spectacular, extraordinary. For his unusual quantity of quality contributions, Turner was duly recognized first by the College Language Association, which gave him its 1971 Creative Scholarship Award, and then the University of Chicago Alumni Association, which presented its Professional Achievement Award in 1972.

Since the first burst during the early years of stage III, Turner's creative contributions have continued at a steady pace. Between 1973 and 1981 he has averaged about 1 book every 3 years, a chapter in a book every year, and an article in a scholarly journal also annually.

During the decade of the 1970s, Turner has been summoned into public affairs as a volunteer and asked to serve numerous public-service and professional associations. For example, he is on the board of trustees of the National Humanities Center. He has been on fellowship selection committees for the National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Rockefeller Foundation. For five years he directed an NEH-sponsored institute for improving research and teaching in Afro-American Studies. For the Modern Language Association he has served as a member of the board of directors and chairman of its Ethnic Studies Division. Likewise, he has served the National Council of Teachers of English as a director. Locally, he was the Iowa State Chairman for a World Festival of Black and African Arts and Culture in the mid-1970s. Internationally, he was chosen as a United States delegate to the African Regional American Studies Conference, Ivory Coast, in 1976, and also to the World Festival of Black and African Arts and Culture, Nigeria, in 1977. Turner was invited to deliver a paper at the annual meeting of the teachers of foreign languages in Germany in 1982. Turner addressed the English language teachers of that country's national language association. These activities are far beyond the call of duty of a professor of English and a chairman of an Afro-American Studies Program, the dual positions Turner has occupied at the University of Iowa since 1972. The multiple requests for Turner's services at local, national, and international levels are indicators of his talent and the esteem of his peers.

Turner has been in the third stage of his career for about 12 years. He is at the midcentury mark in his life, a period when one usually shifts into the fourth stage of career development shortly before or shortly thereafter. It is not easy to predict the life process of an individual. To the extent that the past is prologue for the future, stage III in Turner's career has provided a fine foundation for stage IV. The uncoordinated themes of earlier years seem finally to have fallen together and consolidated into a harmonious whole.

Reputation Among Peers

Darwin Turner and two other black scholars were nominated by leaders in the field as outstanding. A list of these three scholars was submitted to a representative national sample of black and of white professionals in English. The sample was obtained from the membership rosters of the College Language Association and of the Modern Language Association. Of the 100 individuals who ranked the three nominees, 72 percent indicated that Turner was the most outstanding black scholar in English. Turner has received extensive recognition only within the past 10 years. However, his reputation has been maintained by a sustained output of quality works, which have been well received by his peers.

Personal Characteristics

Turner is a person for whom "roots" are important. He is proud of his family background. On a wall in their livingroom the Turners have a roots exhibit that consists of old photographs of both spouses' families and of their own three children. And as mentioned earlier, Jeanne Turner has compiled scrapbooks of news stories, photographs, and Turner's certificates and awards of early achievement.

Turner obviously had the capacity to do good work but scholarly achievement never reached the fullness of its potential until the third stage in his career. Turner's tendency to compartmentalize his professional life and to rationalize the various compartments as complementary rather than contradictory may have interfered with the early development of his scholarship. For example, at one point in his career, he believed that "the jobs of administrator and teacher complement each other." Now that he has been freed from excessive administrative burdens, and has experienced a burst of creative scholarship, he describes even "professional commitments, fellowship-selection committees, and other duties" as getting in the way of scholarship.

In college, Turner had teachers whose instructional methods were models. None, however, did he claim as mentors. Turner was an early achiever without a cheering squad, except, perhaps, his family. He was noticed but not nurtured by many of the adults in his life. He claims that was his own fault rather than theirs.

Turner has extremely high standards for himself; and he sometimes broods over whether he has done the best that he could do. With reference to writing, he said, "I always wanted to do the best kind of job I could. Although I am glad to be published, I usually am a little despondent because I know it is not exactly what I want." He said that his adult daughter commented on the fact that he seldom gets excited over what he has done.

Turner has a profound commitment to scholarship and to the humanities. He is critical of blacks and of others who "still believe that intelligent children should be directed only into fields where money is readily available such as medicine and law." He has found that "there is not the same kind of respect for a humanist, for an education that might bring internal reward but not financial reward." What worries him is that he is not sure that he sees "a major breakthrough" yet, "an increased respect among blacks or whites for work in the humanities."

Turner is disturbed about the absence of commitment to scholarship and to the humanities in our society generally. Personally, however, he has never been "very satisfied" and therefore fully committed to any of his professional positions in the humanities or elsewhere. He states that his feeling is not a reflection on the schools or the jobs but represents his personal orientation. He believes that being "very satisfied" is a "stage [that] begins stagnation." Notwithstanding this feeling, Turner has been a faculty member at the University of Iowa for a decade, a time in which his career has flourished. The "chemistry" if not full satisfaction with his professional situation and personal circumstances has been most beneficial so far as his scholarly contribution is concerned. While Turner may be reluctant to permit himself to become fully committed to what he is doing, others are very satisfied with his output.

Turner is an able, honest, and competent scholar who renders objective appraisals. He is meticulous and careful, understanding and fair. He writes with courage and confidence, revealing both virtue and vice.

Analytic Summary

Acknowledging the interdependence between blacks and the society in which they live, Roger Rosenblatt said that American literary conventions have provided black writers something both to lean on and push against. Darwin Turner made a similar observation when he said of black essayists: they came of age, then rejected the age. This experience of becoming a part of and separating oneself from is continuous and is found in every system in society. It is a process particularly agonizing in the kinship system.

Turner was part of a family of orientation in which the attainment of higher education was a tradition. This orientation supported his early academic achievements. Yet he felt compelled to separate himself from moving in lockstep from one level of educational achievement to the next as quickly as he could. He rejected his family's advice to study for a doctoral degree immediately after completing his master's. Instead, he married, commenced his career, and became a father.

Turner moved directly from a family of orientation that succored and supported him through the first level of graduate study into a family of procreation. He skipped the transitional stage of independent householder and the opportunity this status provides to observe and consider new strategies for living. Because of his new family status before he had turned 21 years old, Turner had to give succor and support to others despite his continuing need for nurturing. The burden, of course, was overwhelming and took its toll, eventually resulting in divorce.

When a career is launched before formal education is complete there may be indecision regarding vocation. This certainly was Turner's experience. Turner resisted committing his future to education even after he became a candidate for the doctoral degree. The interruption with marriage and work of Turner's progression through graduate education complicated the early stage of his career development as a scholar. Because of the requirements of supervised and approved graduate study and household responsibilities of a new family unit, little time was available for research and writing.

Although Turner's doctorate was awarded at an early age, when he was only 25 years old, by the time he had achieved it his career was in progress with 6 years of employment behind him. He was ready, he believed, to take on academic administration as a department chairman and eventually as a dean. The pressures of administration are persistent. He could continue a developed career in scholarship and link it with new responsibilities in administration by limiting the time devoted to each. It is more difficult to start a career in scholarship while at the same time serving as an administrator. This Turner tried to do; but he did it at the price of attempting to compartmentalize his life -- walling off one side of his career from the other, practicing administration by day and scholarship at night. Such a strategy leaves little time for family socialization.

Although fragile and vulnerable, the kinship system is significant -- both the family of orientation and that of procreation. It can orient one toward or away from education. It can enhance or retard the development of a career. Clearly Turner's career accelerated as he moved into its third stage energized and sustained by the nurturance of a new marriage, effected during more mature years, when the doubt of vocation had been resolved, the burden of graduate education was behind him, and the publicity surrounding his preprofessional early achievement had faded away. The second marriage had endured 13 years to the date of this interview.

In the light of this life history, one may hypothesize that there is an association between education and career development and that the completion of graduate education helps launch an academic career; but earlier educational achievement has little effect unless capped by a doctoral degree. Further, one may hypothesize that an association between the kinship system and education exists and that the family may orient one toward education and facilitate its acquisition as long as one remains in its care; the family of procreation may retard the tempo with which one obtains a graduate education if it is formed while one is in midcourse.

Finally, in the light of this life history, one may hypothesize that early acceleration in one's education does not guarantee an outstanding beginning for one's career, and that an unexceptional career beginning does not preclude a spectacular growth along the way and perhaps a fruitful ending for one's career.

Part III

Education and Career: A Survey of ~~Black and of White Scholars~~

Chapter 9

Demographic Analysis of the Study Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 554 respondents in the 6 academic areas selected for the study (Table 9-1). However, not all respondents answered all questions so the totals on the tables in this chapter vary. Percents may not add to 100 because of roundings. Of the small, although not insignificant representation of other racial groups, 44 or 8 percent of the sample represented foreign blacks, foreign whites, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Native Americans, Asian-Americans, and others. Because of their small numbers and heterogeneous circumstances, these groups are eliminated from further statistical analysis. The regions in which the respondents were born were somewhat skewed. Approximately a third of the respondents came from each of the following combined regions[1]: Middle Atlantic and New England (30.9%), East North Central and West North Central (28.1%), and South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central (33.3%). Only the mountain and Pacific regions had a smaller representation; together they totaled 7.8 percent.

---

[1] The U.S. Census Bureau's definition of regions was used for the study. The New England region includes Maine, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire; the Middle Atlantic region includes New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; the East North Central region includes Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin; the West North Central region includes Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas; the South Atlantic region includes Delaware, Maryland, the District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida; the East South Central region includes Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi; the West South Central region includes Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas; the Mountain region includes Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada; the Pacific region includes Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, and Hawaii.

There is a significant difference in the regions of birth for blacks and for whites (Table 9-2a). The majority of blacks were born in the South, compared to only a fifth of the whites. Slightly more than one-third of the whites were born in the Middle Atlantic and New England states compared to a fifth of the blacks. Over twice the proportion of whites were born in the East North Central and West North Central regions compared to blacks.

The same proportion of blacks born in the South remained in the South for their first positions and their current positions (Tables 9-2b, c). The distribution of blacks throughout the various regions of the country remained virtually unchanged from birth to first employment position to current position.

Whites, on the other hand, appeared to be more mobile. Nearly twice as many whites held current positions in the South as had been born there. The proportions of whites who had been born in the combined New England and Middle Atlantic region or the East and West North Central region decreased over the professional career ~~development~~ of the respondents to their current positions. There were slight increases in the proportions of whites who held positions in the Mountain or Pacific states compared to the proportion of whites who were born in these regions.

The ages of the respondents were similar in both racial categories (Table 9-3). The mean age for black respondents was 46 years, for white respondents, 44 years.

The sample was nearly three-fourths male (Table 9-4). The distribution of the sample by sex, however, showed a substantial variation among the racial groups. Blacks had the largest proportion of female respondents, although they were less than a majority. Only 21.3 percent of the whites were females.

The overwhelming majority of the respondents held doctorate degrees (Table 9-5). There was a disparity, however, in the proportions of the racial groups that held doctorates. Proportionately fewer of the blacks held doctorates than whites.

There was [illegible] a great difference in the types of undergraduate colleges selected by members of the various racial groups (Table 9-6). With only one exception, whites graduated from predominantly white colleges and universities. While over half of the blacks graduated from predominantly black colleges or universities, the remainder of the black respondents graduated from predominantly white colleges or universities.

Only 8 of the respondents received doctoral degrees at predominantly black universities. This fact is not surprising since few of the predominantly black institutions offer doctorates. Of the 35 respondents receiving master's degrees at predominantly black institutions, 30 were black.

Similar proportions of blacks and of whites received fellowships in graduate school. The majority of both racial groups also reported relying on their own earnings for support during graduate school, although a greater proportion of blacks used their own earnings than whites. More white respondents than black received family contributions to their support during graduate school.

Career Patterns

Most respondents began their professional careers at four-year colleges or universities (Table 9-7a). While this was true for respondents in both racial categories, more whites than blacks began their careers in these institutions. On the other hand, more blacks began their careers in the service of government than did whites. Extremely small numbers of either racial group were first employed in business or industry.

Although the majority of respondents are currently employed in 4-year colleges or universities, there has been some shift in the organizations at which they are currently employed compared to their first positions (Table 9-7b). A few more of both blacks and whites now work in business or industry or are currently not working.

The majority of respondents held teaching positions for their first professional positions (Table 9-8a); relatively fewer blacks than whites held these positions. A majority still currently holds teaching positions (Table 9-8b). Although this finding holds for both racial groups, proportionately more whites than blacks are currently teachers.

Of those who hold tenure or tenure-track teaching positions, the largest number of respondents currently holds the rank of full professor (Table 9-9). Again, this is true for both racial groups; however, blacks have a lower proportion of full professors. There is little difference between the proportions of blacks and of whites holding the rank of associate professor; proportionately more blacks than whites hold the rank of assistant professor.

Just over half the respondents indicated that they were very satisfied with their first positions (Table 9-10a). The overwhelming majority of both racial groups expressed either strong satisfaction or some satisfaction with their first positions; very few indicated dissatisfaction with their first positions. Again, the great majority -- slightly more whites than blacks -- in both racial groups indicated that they are either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their current positions (Table 9-10b). Very few respondents indicated dissatisfaction with their current positions.

The respondents were asked to report the salaries they received for their first postdoctoral positions and for their current positions (Table 11). The question was optional, however, and data are avaiable for slightly more than half the sample. For both positions, the median salary of blacks and whites was similar, although slightly lower for whites.

The Contribution of Race and Age to the Salary of the Scholars

During the 1970s considerable controversy developed around the issue of whether race was declining in significance as the basis for determining the life-chances of blacks in the United States economy. Sociologist William Wilson endorsed the assertion by economist Richard Freeman that "the more educated blacks continue to experience a faster rate of job advancement than their white counterparts" (Wilson, 1978:153; Freeman, 1976: Chapter 6). Wilson buttressed his contention with figures that he obtained from the 1973 Current Population Report that, according to him, "show that black men with college degrees in the 25 to 29 age category earn close to $1,000 more than their white counterparts" (Wilson, 1979:166).

Wilson is careful to limit his analysis to "younger educated black males." He acknowledges that "there is still a significant income gap between all college educated blacks," but he attributes this gap to income of older educated blacks, whose income compared with whites he describes as due to "the legacies of past discrimination." When the analysis is limited to younger college-educated black males, Wilson contends that they "have reached income parity with younger college educated white males" (Wilson, 1979:168).

One of the present authors has challenged the Wilson conclusion (Willie, 1979). He contends that despite the relatively high pay that some younger college-educated blacks may receive, all blacks (including younger blacks) are underrepresented in the high-paying professional, managerial, sales, and skilled-craft jobs. During 1976, for example, there were only 1.1 million racial minorities in these high-paying jobs when there should have been 2.3 million if there were equity in employment. Moreover, "these high-paying jobs ... would have contributed two-thirds of the total income received by the population of blacks and other minorities if there were as many racial minorities as there should have been in these ... jobs." As it was, "these four high-paying occupational categories accounted for only one-third of the total income for blacks . . because of the limitations imposed by racial discrimination." Among whites, two-thirds of their income was derived from these high-paying jobs. The underrepresentation of blacks in high-paying jobs depressed their income as a group despite the relatively high income received by some educated younger blacks (Willie, 1979:60-61).

A study sponsored by the United States Civil Rights Commission during the 1970s attempted to determine whether the problem of less pay for blacks and other racial minorities relative to whites was a function of the different characteristics that these groups exhibited, or a function of discrimination that awarded unequal compensation for equal work. By statistical techniques, the study controlled for differences in level of education, level of job prestige, region of employment, age, and other factors so that the situations of the various populations would be equivalent. This study found that when blacks and whites were equal in age, sex, education, and occupation, black and other minority males received an annual income that was 15 to 20 percent less than that received by majority white males (Civil Rights Commission, 1978:54).

The findings reported from different sources obviously are mixed. The absence of consensus may be due to the different characteristics of populations studies: their age, occupation, education, and other characteristics With reference to age, Wilson has described older educated blacks as victims of the legacy of racial discrimination; but such an explanation is insufficient. It does not explain why they continue to receive unequal pay for equal work. A society need not continue to discriminate against older educated blacks today simply because it discriminated against them in the past. Moreover, some of the older educated blacks who receive less pay than whites are not so old; some are between 40 and 50 years of age.

The data from this study will not provide a definitive answer to the issues discussed above. However, they do permit a comparative analysis of the annual salaries of black and of white scholars who are members of national professional associations in six disciplines of the humanities and social sciences. Because these data are limited to scholars and to the humanities and social sciences, they cannot be generalized. Yet because they deal with a specific category of professionals, there are fewer unanticipated and extraneous influences to confuse the analysis and make difficult an interpretation. The following analysis is presented, therefore, as one contribution toward clarifying the issue of the relative effects of race on life-chances of blacks and of whites in terms of salaries received.

Of the 554 scholars included in this study, 264 or 48 percent provided information about their annual salaries. The ages of the respondents were similar for blacks and whites. While these data will not permit us to make observations about professionals 30 years or under because few received doctoral degrees and became active in professional associations at this young age, the salaries of adults 40 or younger, middle-ages adults 41 to 60, and older adults 61 years of age and over can be analyzed. Thus, this analysis holds the professional category of scholar as a constant and provides a comparative analysis of the scholars by race, age, and salary.

Table 9-12 indicates that both black and white professional scholars in the humanities and social sciences have attained parity in terms of salary received as reflected by the similar medians. However, the similarity in salary for the total racial populations of scholars did not hold for all age groups. Among younger scholars, particularly those 31 to 40 years of age, the median annual salary for black humanists and social scientists was nearly 36 percent higher than that received by whites. The phenomenon of higher pay for blacks was not true for age categories 41 to 50; this group of blacks had a median salary that was $1,513 less than whites of the same age. Higher median salary for whites than for blacks continued through the older age groups of 61 years and above.

The large difference in salary by race in the age group over 60 years can be explained as due to discrimination in the past that cannot be corrected so easily in the present. Blacks who are 41 to 50 years of age had a median salary about 5 percent less than whites; the differences in mean salaries, however, was just over 1 percent. Similarly, blacks aged 51 to 60 had a median salary of 4.5 percent less than whites, but their mean salaries differed by only 2.0 percent.

The salaries were regrouped into three broad categories: low (under $20,000 a year), middle ($20,001 to $30,000), and high ($30,001 and above). Table 9-13 reveals that the higher median salary reported for blacks compared with whites in the younger adult age group aged 40 years or under is due largely to the fact that one-third of all affluent blacks (those with incomes above $30,000) achieve this status by the age of 40 years and that this proportion is twice as great as the proportion of young adult whites who are similarly paid.

Of the blacks in this study, 48 percent were younger people under 40 years of age who had salaries in the lower-range, middle-range and affluent levels. Of all blacks, 13 percent were young and affluent and had a median salary that exceeded that of whites of a comparable age level. Not all young blacks were affluent, however. Of the 41 blacks under 40 years of age in our sample, about one fourth was at the middle range from $20,000 to $30,000; and slightly less than one third was under $20,000 at the lower end of the pay scale for professionals in 1980.

Of the 87 young white scholars under 40 years in our study, only one tenth qualified as affluent with an annual salary over $30,000 a year; slightly more than two-fifths was at the middle-range level; and about one-third received under $20,000 a year.

In summary, only the young blacks tend to forge ahead of whites in salary in any significant way. But this is not the common experience for all young educated blacks in the humanities and social sciences. Of the black scholars 40 years or under, 7 to 8 out of every 10 earned less than $30,000 in 1980. However, the overall pattern indicates that blacks aged 40 years or younger tend to earn more than whites; blacks ages 41 to 60 tend to earn somewhat less than whites; and blacks over 60 tend to earn substantially less than whites. Two possible explanations of this phenomenon are (1) that a premium is paid to recruit young black scholars in a market-place where black scholars are scarce, and (2) that this "talented tenth" of black scholars (actually, they are 13 percent of all black scholars) is extraordinary and outstanding and merits premium pay. This phenomenon of higher pay for young talented blacks began ~~this began~~ only within the past 15 years or so, when affirmative-action programs were implemented. Despite their talent, older black scholars evidently did not benefit as much financially from such efforts as did younger black scholars. It is possible, however, that some of the earlier racial discrimination that had actually resulted in greater discrepancies in salaries can be remedied to a degree by affirmative-action programs for the older scholars. Our data indicate that as the scholars get older, the gap between blacks and whites increases.

Family Background

The educational achievements of the parents of the respondents varied greatly by race. Over half of the fathers of the black respondents had not graduated from high school, compared to slightly less than a third of the fathers of white respondents (Table 9-14a). At the other end of the educational scale, nearly twice as many white fathers (slightly less than one-fifth) graduated from college as black fathers and twice as many white fathers (about one-fifth) had graduate degrees as black fathers.

For mothers, the findings were somewhat different. Nearly half of the black mothers, although only about a quarter of the white mothers, had not received high-school diplomas (Table 9-14b). Twice as many white mothers (about one-fifth) as black mothers graduated from college. More black mothers had achieved graduate degrees than white mothers.

There were also great differences among the racial groups concerning occupational status of the parents. The modal occupational status for black fathers was service worker, laborer, or farmer (Table 9-15a). Very few whites held this type of position. The modal category for white fathers was professional or technical; slightly more than one-third of the white fathers held positions at this level compared to about one-fifth of the black fathers. One-fourth of the white fathers were managers, administrators or small-business owners compared with only one-tenth of the black fathers.

Again, the findings concerning mothers are somewhat different. The modal occupation of both racial groups of mothers was housekeeping spouse (Table 9-15b). However, far more white mothers held this position than black mothers. Far more black mothers held positions as service workers or laborers than white mothers. At the higher status end of the scale, however, slightly more black mothers held professional or technical positions than white mothers; in both groups of women, professionals were less than one-fourth of employed female spouses.

Comparison of Black and of White Scholars

Major differences between black and white scholars had to do with sex composition of the two racial populations, their family backgrounds, and their rank of initial and current appointment in colleges and universities. Women are beginning to occupy scholarly positions in the labor force but they claimed only one-fourth of all positions in the total sample of this study. Thus women were underrepresented by about 50 percent. The underrepresentation in racial populations was least among blacks, where there were 6 men to every 4 women and greater among whites, where the ratio was 8 to 2.

In terms of family background, white scholars continued a family tradition of employment in white-collar occupations. But the majority of the parents of the black scholars were blue-collar workers. Most of the black scholars had mothers who were in the labor force; in comparison, a majority of the mothers of white scholars were housekeeping spouses. Another interesting background difference has to do with the relative educational achievement of the mother and the father in families of black and of white scholars. The scholars in both racial populations exceeded the educational accomplishments of their parents. However, a higher proportion of fathers compared with mothers in white families were college graduates (38% to 26%), but the proportion of college graduates among black mothers and fathers was the same (21%). Also it should be noted that the proportion of black mothers with a graduate degree (10%) is greater than the proportion of white mothers with a graduate degree (6%). Among fathers a reverse of this situation is found; the proportion of white fathers with a graduate degree (20%) is twice the proportion of black fathers with a graduate degree (11%).

The fact that the educational levels of black mothers have achieved parity with that of black fathers in terms of the proportions who had obtained a college education is an interesting finding that may be related to the upward mobility of black scholars. This finding should be studied carefully to determine the contribution of the education of mothers and their labor force status in all racial populations to the achievement of their offspring.

A final difference worthy of noting between these two racial populations has to do with current rank in relation to initial rank of appointment as an academician. While the majority of both populations began their careers as instructors or assistant professors, half of the white scholars in education have current appointments as full professors compared with only slightly more than one-third of the black scholars. While about 10 percentage points that favored blacks separated the two racial populations initially appointed as full professors, now 12 to 13 percentage points against blacks separate the two racial populations in terms of current employment in the two lowest ranks. Thus blacks, who slightly outdistanced whites in obtaining the highest initial academic appointments, now have a higher proportion than whites currently holding appointments in the lower academic ranks. Whether blacks were unable to sustain their head start in academic rank because of the lower proportion who finally obtained doctoral degrees compared with whites, or because they taught in different types of colleges, or because they were discriminated against, we could not determine from the data available.

Table 9-1 Race of Respondents

Race	N	%
U.S. black	179	32.3
U.S. white	324	58.5
Other	44	8.0
Missing data	7	1.2
Total	554	100.0

Table 9-2 U.S. Regional Data by Race

a. Region of Birth by Race

Race	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Black	36	20.8	28	16.2	105	60.7	2	1.2	[illegible]	1.2	173
White	110	35.3	111	35.6	59	18.9	14	4.5	18	5.8	312
Total	146	30.1	139	28.7	164	33.8	16	3.3	20	4.1	485

b. Region of First Employment by Race

Race	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Black	31	18.1	28	16.4	104	60.8	1	0.6	7	4.1	171
White	82	26.2	94	30.0	100	31.9	16	5.1	21	6.7	313
Total	113	23.3	122	25.2	204	42.1	17	3.5	28	5.8	484

c. Region of Current Employment by Race

Race	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Black	30	17.7	28	16.6	103	60.9	1	.6	7	4.1	169
White	74	23.8	80	25.7	109	35.0	20	6.4	28	9.0	311
Total	104	21.7	108	22.5	212	44.2	21	4.4	35	7.3	480

(a) Middle Atlantic and New England; (b) East and West North Central; (c) South; (d) Mountain; (e) Pacific; (f) total.

Table 9-3 Age by Race

Race	Year of Birth																
	1890-1899		1900-09		1910-19		1920-29		1930-39		1940-49		1950-59		Total	Mean Age (years)	Median Age (years)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
U.S. black	0	0	10	5.8	14	8.1	32	18.6	39	22.7	70	40.7	7	4.1	172	46	43
U.S. white	2	0.6	5	1.5	21	6.5	63	19.5	88	27.2	131	40.6	13	4.0	323	44	42
Totals	2	0.4	15	3.0	35	7.1	95	19.2	127	25.7	201	40.6	20	4.0	495		

Table 9-4 Race by Sex

	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	N
U.S. black	107	60.1	71	39.9	178
U.S. white	255	78.7	69	21.3	324
Totals	362	72.1	140	27.9	502

Table 9-5 Respondents with Doctoral Degrees

Race	N	%
U.S. black (N = 179)	129	72.1
U.S. white (N = 324)	296	91.4
Total (N = 503)	425	84.5

Table 9-6 Predominant Race of College Where Bachelor's Degree Was Obtained

	School				
Race	Predominantly Black		Predominantly White		Total
	N	%	N	%	N
U.S. black	92	53.8	79	46.2	171
U.S. white	2	0.6	315	99.4	317
Totals	94	19.3	394	80.7	488

Table 9-7 Type of Organization of Employment

a. First Professional Position

Race	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)		(g)		(h)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
U.S. black	2	1.1	3	1.7	126	70.8	21	11.9	9	5.1	15	8.4	2	1.1	178
U.S. white	6	1.9	9	2.8	250	77.2	27	8.3	14	4.3	16	4.9	2	0.6	324
Totals	8	1.6	12	2.4	376	74.9	43	9.6	23	4.6	31	6.1	4	0.8	502

(a) business or industry; (b) junior college or technical institute; (c) college or university; (d) government agency; (e) other nonprofit organization; (f) other; (g) not working; (h) total

Table 9-7 Type of Organization of Employment

b. Current Professional Position

Race	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)		(g)		(h)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
U.S. black	5	2.8	2	1.1	119	66.5	21	11.7	8	4.5	11	6.1	13	7.3	179
U.S. white	16	4.9	9	2.8	246	75.9	17	5.2	13	4.0	16	4.9	7	2.2	324
Totals	21	4.2	11	2.2	365	72.6	38	7.6	21	4.2	27	5.4	20	4.0	503

(a) business or industry; (b) junior college or technical institute; (c) college or university; (d) government agency; (e) other nonprofit organization; (f) other; (g) not working; (h) total.

Table 9-8 Type of Work

a. First Professional Position

Race	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)		(g)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
U.S. black	116	67.1	4	2.3	3	1.7	6	3.5	8	4.6	36	20.8	173
U.S. white	255	78.9	9	2.8	3	.9	7	2.2	21	6.5	28	8.7	323
Totals	371	74.8	13	2.6	6	1.2	13	2.6	29	5.8	64	12.9	496

(a) teaching; (b) research; (c) college administration; (d) analyst; (e) clinician; (f) other; (g) total.

Table 9-8 Type of Work

b. Current Professional Position

	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)		(g)
Race	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
U.S. black	111	65.7	3	1.8	8	4.7	5	3.0	8	4.7	34	20.1	169
U.S. black	249	78.3	2	0.6	6	1.9	7	2.2	13	4.1	41	12.9	318
Totals	360	73.9	5	1.0	14	2.9	12	2.5	21	4.3	75	15.4	487

(a) teaching; (b) research; (c) college administration; (d) analyst; (e) clinician; (f) other; (g) total.

Table 9-9 Current Job Rank for Academics

Race	(a) N	(a) %	(b) N	(b) %	(c) N	(c) %	(d) N	(d) %	N
U.S. black	3	2.7	34	30.9	33	30.0	40	36.4	110
U.S. white	1	.4	50	20.6	70	28.8	122	50.2	243
Totals	4	1.1	84	23.8	103	29.2	162	45.9	353

(a) instructor; (b) assistnat professor; (c) associate professor; (d) professor; (e) total.

203

Table 9-10 Satisfaction with Professional Position

	a. First Position						
	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)
Race	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
U.S. black	76	45.5	81	48.5	10	6.0	167
U.S. white	165	53.4	124	40.1	20	6.5	309
Totals	241	50.6	205	43.1	30	6.3	476

(a) very satisfied; (b) somewhat satisfied; (c) not satisfied; (d) total.

Table 9-10 Satisfaction with Professional Position

b. Current Position

Race	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
U.S. black	88	52.4	67	39.9	13	7.7	168
U.S. white	193	60.5	113	35.4	13	4.1	319
Totals	281	57.7	180	37.0	26	5.3	487

(a) very satisfied; (b) somewhat satisfied; (c) not satisfied; (d) total

Table 9-11 Income

a. First Professional Position

	≤$3,000		$3,001 to $6,000		$6,001 to $9,000		$9,001 to $12.000		$12,001 to $15,000		$15,001 to $18,000		$18,001 to $21,000		$21,001 to $24,000		$24,001 to $27,000		$27,001 to $30,000		over $30,000		Total	Median
Race	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
U.S. black	5	5.7	14	21.8	7	8.0	18	20.7	18	20.7	7	3.9	10	5.6	2	2.3	2	2.3	3	3.4	1	1.1	87	$8,917
U.S. white	4	2.2	39	21.4	34	18.7	55	30.2	33	18.1	5	2.7	5	2.7	2	1.1	0		0		5	2.7	182	$8,122
Totals	9	3.3	53	19.7	41	15.2	73	27.1	51	19.0	12	4.5	15	5.6	4	1.5	2	0.7	3	1.1	6	2.2	269	

Table 9-11 Income

b. Professional Position

	$10,000		$10,001 to $15,000		$15,001 to $20,000		$20,001 to $25,000		$25,001 to $30,000		$30,001 to $35,000		$35,001 to $40,000		$40,001 to $45,000		45,001 to $50,000		over $50,000		To-tal	Median	Mean
Race	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N		
U.S. black	0		2	2.3	19	21.8	21	24.1	12	13.8	12	13.8	11	12.6	2	2.3	4	4.6	4	4.6	87	$26,008	$31,43
U.S. white	1	0.5	9	4.9	36	19.6	41	22.3	37	20.1	24	13.0	17	9.2	7	3.8	6	3.3	6	3.3	184	$25,994	$28,17
Totals	1	0.4	11	4.1	55	20.3	62	22.9	49	18.1	36	13.3	28	10.3	9	3.3	10	3.7	10	3.7	271		

Table 9-12

Current Annual Salary of 264 Scholars, 1980

Current Annual Salary	Age of Scholar (years)											
	21-30		31-40		41-50		51-60		61-80		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Black Scholars												
$20,000 or less	-		13	33.3	4	19.0	-		4	44.4	21	24.4
$20,001-30,000	1	50.0	16	41.0	9	42.9	5	33.3	1	11.1	32	37.2
$30,001-40,000	1	50.0	7	17.9	6	28.6	7	46.7	2	22.2	23	26.7
$40,001-50,000	-		2	5.1	-		2	13.3	2	22.2	6	7.0
over $50,000	-		1	2.6	2	9.5	1	6.7	-		4	4.7
Totals	2	100.0	39	100.0	21	100.0	15	100.0	9	100.0	86	100.0
Median	$28,000		$22,036		$27,500		$32,000		$24,000		$26,007	
Mean	$28,000		$32,107		$29,372		$35,053		$25,586			
White Scholars												
$20,000 or less	7	87.5	30	38.0	5	10.4	4	10.8	-		46	25.3
$20,001-30,000	1	12.5	40	50.6	23	47.9	10	27.0	3		77	42.3
$30,001-40,000	-		6	7.6	16	33.3	14	37.8	4		40	22.0
$40,001-50,000	-		2	2.5	3	6.3	5	13.5	3		13	7.1
over $50,000	-		1	1.3	1	2.1	4	10.8	-		6	3.3
Total	8	100.0	79	100.0	48	100.0	37	100.0	10		182	100.0
Median	$16,000		$21,997		$29,013		$33,500		$35,250		$25,994	
Mean	$17,135		$23,619		$29,783		$35,823		$35,690			

Table 9-13

Age and Salary Distribution of 264 Scholars by Number and Percent in Age-Salary Specific Categories, by Ratio of Percent of Total Population by Age to Percent in Age-Salary Specific Categories, and by Percentage Distribution of Racial Groups in Age-Salary Specific Categories, 1980

[illegible]	Salary (by percent)							
Age of Scholars (years)	Low		Middle		High		Black and White	
	$20,000		$20,001-30,000		Over $30,000		Total	
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Percent	Number
30 or under	—	15	3	2	3	—	4	10
31-40	62	65	50	51	30	16	45	118
41-50	19	11	28	30	25	36	26	69
51-60	—	9	16	13	30	35	18	48
61	19	—	3	4	12	13	7	19
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	264

Table 9-14 Education of Parents

a. Father

Race	(a) N	(a) %	(b) N	(b) %	(c) N	(c) %	(d) N	(d) %	(e) N	(e) %	(f) N	(f) %	(g) N
U.S. black	53	30.5	37	21.3	34	19.5	15	8.6	16	9.2	19	10.9	174
U.S. white	32	10.0	65	20.4	55	17.2	45	14.1	57	17.9	65	20.4	319
Totals	85	17.2	102	20.7	89	18.1	60	12.2	73	14.8	84	17.0	493

b. Mother

Race	(a) N	(a) %	(b) N	(b) %	(c) N	(c) %	(d) N	(d) %	(e) N	(e) %	(f) N	(f) %	(g) N
U.S. black	27	15.6	51	29.5	36	20.8	23	13.3	18	10.4	18	10.4	173
U.S. white	16	5.0	62	19.4	95	29.7	62	19.4	65	20.3	20	6.3	320
Totals	53	10.8	113	22.9	131	26.6	85	17.2	83	16.8	38	7.7	493

(a) up to seventh grade; (b) some high school; (c) high-school graduate; (d) some college; (e) college graduate or some graduate school; (f) graduate degree; (g) total.

Table 9-15 Occupation of Parents

a. Father

Race	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)		(g)		(h)		(i)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
U.S. black	1	0.6	59	33.5	30	17.0	27	15.3	2	1.1	2	1.1	21	11.9	34	19.3	176
U.S. white	1	0.3	27	8.4	22	6.9	42	13.1	6	1.9	29	9.1	77	24.1	116	36.3	320
Totals	2	0.4	86	17.3	52	10.5	69	13.9	8	1.6	31	6.3	98	19.8	150	30.2	496

(a) unemployed; (b) service worker, laborer, farmer; (c) semiskilled operative; (d) skilled crafts; (e) clerical; (f) sales; (g) manager, administrator, small-business owner; (h) professional, technical; (i) total.

Table 9-15 Occupation of Parents

Race	b. Mother (a) N	%	(b) N	%	(c) N	%	(d) N	%	(e) N	%	(f) N	%	(g) N	%	(h) N	%	(i) N	%	(j) N
U.S. black	4	2.3	65	37.1	43	24.6	6	3.4	7	4.0	5	2.9	0	-	4	2.3	41	23.4	175
U.S. white	2	0.6	185	57.5	12	3.7	0	-	4	1.2	36	11.2	14	4.3	13	4.0	56	17.4	322
Totals	6	1.2	250	50.3	55	11.1	6	1.2	11	2.2	41	8.2	14	2.8	17	3.4	97	19.5	497

(a) unemployed; (b) housekeeping spouse; (c) service worker, laborer, farmer; (d) semiskilled operative; (e) skilled crafts; (f) clerical; (g) sales; (h) manager, administrator, small-business operator; (i) professional, technical; (j) total.

Chapter 10

Career Patterns by Age and by Race

Although this is not a longitudinal study, an examination of the relationship between age and a number of dependent variables will reveal the differences and similarities in career patterns between older and younger scholars of both races. As previously noted, the median age for blacks in this study is 46 years compared to 44 years for whites. For males and females of both races, the modal age category is 31-40 years (see Table 10-1).

With the exception of blacks aged 21-30 years, three-fourths of all respondents of both races in all age categories began their professional careers with positions in higher education (see Table 10-2a). An extremely small number of respondents of any age began their careers in business or industry. Blacks of all age categories had a small but notable representation in government agencies for their first positions; this type of first position appears to have increased in popularity for blacks 50 years or younger. And although the total number of respondents aged 21-30 is very small, over a quarter [redacted] held first professional positions in government agencies.

The pattern for whites starting out in government agencies is somewhat different. The proportion beginning their careers in government positions hovered around 10 percent for those between 41 and 70 years of age. The proportion in the age category 31-40 who started out in the government dropped to 6.1 percent, and no whites aged 21-30 started out with government positions.

The type of first position held by blacks and whites showed a similar pattern (see Table 10-3a). Again, the youngest age group of blacks proved to be the only exception to the finding that the majority of all respondents of both races and in all age groups began their careers teaching. Those who did not begin their careers teaching chose a number of positions, but there are some apparent distinctions between blacks and whites. Of the whites who began their careers in nonteaching positions, most respondents in all age categories except 41-50 held positions in research. Whites 41-50 years old were slightly more likely to hold first positions as clinicians. No whites 51 years or older began their careers as administrators, while extremely small proportions of whites 50 or younger began as administrators.

Blacks, on the other hand, had a much greater likelihood of starting their careers as administrators. For blacks 61-70 years old, over a quarter held first positions as administrators. Only blacks in the age group 51-60 had less than 10 percent of its members beginning as administrators. The proportion of blacks beginning their careers in research increased to 10 percent for those aged 31-50 and to 14 percent for those 21-30.

Of those who held their first positions in colleges or universities, the majority of the black respondents in all age categories were employed at predominantly black colleges (see Table 10-4a). The proportion ~~of these~~ working at predominantly black colleges decreased substantially for ~~[illegible]~~ blacks 50 or younger compared to those 51 or older. For whites, the pattern was stable for all age groups. Only a handful of whites in all age categories began their careers at predominantly black colleges, less than 3 percent.

Blacks 51 years of age or over had a high probability of starting their careers at colleges that are currently ranked less competitive or lower on Barron's scale (BES 1978) (see Table 10-5a). Blacks aged 41-50 years were more spread out in colleges with a variety of rankings than their older counterparts. Indeed, blacks in this age group were the first to have a few respondents in colleges that placed in the top three rankings. Of the black respondents aged 31-40, a full 10 percent held first positions in the most competitive schools, and another 10 percent held first positions in very competitive or highly competitive schools.

For whites, the pattern again is very different. For all age categories, the large majority of white respondents held first positions at schools ranked competitive or higher (see Table 10-5b). The modal category for all age groups of white scholars was competitive, but sizeable proportions of whites of all ages started out in schools with higher rankings.

Older blacks who taught for their first positions were more likely to begin their careers as full professors than were whites (see Table 10-6a). Over 70 percent of the blacks aged 71-80 years began their careers as full professors, while no whites in this age category held this rank. The proportion of blacks starting out as full professors declined over the next two age groupings to none starting out as full professors for those who were 50 years or younger.

With the exceptions of 71-80-year-olds, and the one respondent in the age group 21-30, the modal category for blacks entering the academic ranking system was assistant professor. The age group 61-70, however, was equally distributed among four rankings. Assistant professor was also the modal entering rank for whites who began their careers teaching, but those aged 61-70 had an equal proportion starting out as lecturers.

Whites aged 40 years or younger had very little opportunity to begin their careers above the assistant-professor level, although their older counterparts had started out at higher levels in a fair number of cases. Although the proportion of blacks starting out as associate professors declined slightly for younger blacks compared to older blacks, the proportion of blacks beginning their careers at the rank of associate professor hovered around one-fifth for those 50 years or younger.

The overwhelming majority of all respondents, both black and white, currently hold positions in institutions of higher education, no matter what their age (see Table 10-7). The only exception to this is blacks aged 21-30. Small proportions of respondents in any age group and of either race are employed in business or industry. No white respondents aged 61 or over currently works for a government agency, nor does any black respondent 71 or older. Government employment has become more popular with blacks, but has remained an unpopular choice among all age groups of whites.

Although there is some variation among the age groups of both races, with the exception of blacks aged 21-30, at least half of both black and white repondents in all age groups currently hold teaching positions (see Table 10-3b). While all age groups of whites have a minimum of 10 percent of their members currently engaged in research, only three age groupings of blacks have any members engaged in this endeavor. With the exception of the small number of both blacks and whites 71 years or older, it appears that research is most popular with both blacks and whites aged 31-40. This finding probably is related to the fact that the teaching market shrank when many of the candidates of this age category were seeking either new positions or tenure. Small numbers of respondents of both races chose to enter clinical work no matter what their age.

Again, administration is more popular among blacks of all ages than among whites. Over a third of the blacks aged 51-60 years are currently employed as administrators as are almost half of the small number of blacks aged 21-30. It is possible to speculate that blacks aged 51-60 have made administration their career goals while younger blacks possibly were responding to the shrinking teaching market and affirmative action requirements to diversify administrative staffs. With the exception of whites aged 31-40, the proportion in each age group of whites holding positions as administrators hovers around 15 percent.

With the exception of blacks age 31-40, at least half of the blacks in each age category who currently work in colleges are located at predominantly black colleges (see Table 10-4b). The proportion of blacks employed at black colleges decreases with the decrease in age (with the exception of the youngest age group, where the sample includes only two individuals). Thus, just as attendance at predominantly black colleges decreases for younger blacks, working at predominantly black colleges also decreases for younger blacks. Whites, on the other hand, have maintained a highly stable pattern of working at predominantly white colleges, no matter what their age.

The large majority of blacks are currently employed at colleges that are ranked either less competitive or competitive (see Table 10-5b). Small but notable proportions of blacks in the age range 41-50 are employed in highly competitive schools. While a small number of blacks aged 31-40 are employed in highly competitive colleges, substantial proportions are employed in colleges that fall in the top three rankings. There does not appear to be any consistent pattern by age.

The modal ranking of current college of employment for whites of all ages is competitive. Only 2 of the white respondents aged 61 or over are employed at colleges in the top half of the ranking scale. Nearly one-fourth of the whites aged 51-60 and over one-fourth of whites aged 41-50 currently work in colleges in the top half of the ranking scale. Although a lower proportion of whites aged 31-40 work at colleges in the top half of the scale, 7.5 percent in this age group work at most competitive colleges. This proportion is slightly lower than blacks of the same age who work at most competitive colleges.

Lower proportions of blacks than whites have achieved the status of full professor in all age groupings (see Table 10-6b). Indeed, nearly twice as many whites aged 31-40 are full professors compared to blacks in the same age group. While a fifth of the blacks aged 41-50 years are at the assistant professor level, a much smaller number of the whites in this age range hold this rank. In the 31-40 age group, over half of the blacks are at the rank of assistant professor compared to only a third of the whites; slightly over a third of blacks in this age age range have been promoted to associate professor compared to almost half of the whites. Thus, whites have achieved higher status positions than blacks, even among those blacks who seemingly would have benefitted from affirmative-action programs.

Few respondents claimed not to be satisfied at all with their current or first positions (see Tables 10-8a and 10-8b). Rates of dissatisfaction were higher for blacks, however, and were inversely related to age ~~(See Table 10-8).~~

Income data analyzed in broad categories in chapter 9 are reviewed here in greater detail by age. Few black or white scholars earned a salary over $40,000 in 1980; about 1 out of every 10 in both racial populations was in this income category.

The data in Table 10-7 are organized into 4 income categories:

(a) over 40 thousand dollars, (b) 30-40 thousand dollars, (c) 20-30 thousand dollars, (d) under 20 thousand dollars. Median age was computed for the racial population in each income category. Blacks tended to move above the lowest income category for professional scholars at a younger age than whites. At least half of the whites who received salaries under $20,000 were ~~as old as~~ 35.8 years of age; for blacks the median age in the lowest income category was only 28.3 years. Blacks and whites had a similar median, 39.4 years, for the next salary category. Whites who had lagged behind blacks in moving out of the lowest salary bracket caught up with blacks in terms of the median age that they earned a salary at the median or mean of the total salary scale. But blacks arrived at the next income category ahead of whites; of those who earned $30,000 to $40,000, half were under 42.2 years. The median age for whites in this income category was 6 years higher at 48.9 years. Blacks who reached the highest income category for scholars in the social sciences and humanities had a median of 50.5 years that was 3 years under the white median of 53.5 years. Clearly some blacks received above average salaries when they were 3 to 6 years younger than some whites. Moreover, the proportion of blacks distributed in the various income categories is similar to that for whites.

In summary, there is a direct association between age and income for both racial populations, with older scholars tending to earn more than younger scholars. Among blacks, however, younger scholars tended to have quicker access to higher incomes than such scholars who were white. The black population would appear to be more flexible in providing equal access by age and sex to income and occupational opportunities for its members.

Table 10-1 **Sex by Age and Race**

	Males					Females				
	Black		White		Total	Black		White		Total
Age (years)	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N
71-80	10	9.5	5	2.0	15	-		-		-
61-70	8	7.6	19	7.5	29	6	9.1	2	3.4	8
51-60	19	18.1	50	19.8	69	13	19.7	3	5.1	16
41-50	30	28.6	75	29.8	105	8	12.1	13	22.0	21
31-40	35	33.3	94	37.3	129	35	53.0	37	62.7	72
21-30	3	2.9	9	3.6	12	4	6.1	4	6.8	8
	105	100.0	252	100.0	359	66	100.0	59	100.0	125

Note: See duplicate copy p. 10-22 ([illegible] [illegible] note on p. 10-10)

Table 10-2, First Employment Organization By Age and Race

	Blacks									Whites								
	(a) Business,		(b)* Higher*		Government					(a) Business,		(b) Higher*		Government (c)		(d) Other		(e) Total
Age	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
71-80	-		7	77.8	1	11.1	1	11.1	9	-		4	100.0	-		-		4
61-70	-		9	75.0	1	8.3	2	16.7	12	-		17	81.0	2	9.5	2	9.5	21
51-60	-		26	83.9	1	3.2	4	12.9	31	3	4.8	47	74.6	7	11.1	6	9.5	63
41-50	-		30	76.9	5	12.8	4	10.3	39	2	2.3	71	80.7	9	10.2	6	6.8	88
31-40	1	1.4	51	73.9	7	10.1	10	14.5	69	-		110	84.0	8	6.1	13	9.9	131
21-30	1	14.3	1	14.3	2	28.6	3	42.9	7	1	8.3	9	75.0	-		2	16.7	12

*Includes 12 who were at junior colleges or technical institutes: 3 blacks and 9 whites

(a) business, industry; (b) higher education; (c) government agency; (d) other; (e) total

Table 10-2a First Employment Organization by Age and by Race

	Blacks									Whites									
	(a)		(b)*		(c)		(d)		(e)	(a)		(b)*		(c)		(d)		(e)
Age (years)	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
71-80	-		7	77.8	1	11.1	1	11.1	9	-		4	100.0	-		-		4
61-70	-		9	75.0	1	8.3	2	16.7	12	-		17	81.0	2	9.5	2	9.5	21
51-60	-		26	83.9	1	3.2	4	12.9	31	3	4.8	47	74.6	7	11.1	6	9.5	63
41-50	-		30	76.9	5	12.8	4	10.3	39	2	2.3	71	80.7	9	10.2	6	6.8	88
31-40	1	1.4	51	73.9	7	10.1	10	14.5	69	-		110	84.0	8	6.1	13	9.9	131
21-30	1	14.3	1	14.3	2	28.6	3	42.9	7	1	8.3	9	75.0	-		2	16.7	12

*Includes 12 who were at junior colleges or technical institutes: 3 blacks and 9 whites

(a) business, industry; (b) higher education; (c) government agency; (d) other; (e) total

Table 10-2b Current Employment Organization by Age and by Race

	Blacks									Whites									
	(a)		(b)*		(c)		(d)		(e)	(a)		(b)*		(c)		(d)		(e)
Age (years)	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
71-80	-		2	100.0	-		-		2	-		3	100.0	-		-		3
61-70	1	9.1	9	81.8	1	9.1	-		11	-		17	89.5	-		2	10.5	19
51-60	-		25	80.6	2	6.5	4	12.9	31	4	6.5	50	80.6	4	6.5	4	6.5	62
41-50	1	2.6	30	76.9	3	7.7	5	12.8	39	5	5.7	68	77.3	6	6.8	9	10.2	88
31-40	2	2.9	49	71.0	11	15.9	7	10.1	69	6	4.6	106	81.5	7	5.4	11	8.5	130
21-30	1	14.3	3	42.9	3	42.9	-		7	1	7.7	10	76.9	-		2	15.4	13
Totals	5	3.1	118	74.2	20	12.6	16	10.1	159	16	5.1	254	80.6	17	5.4	28	8.9	315

*Includes 10 who are at junior colleges or technical institutes: 1 black and 9 whites

(a) business, industry; (b) higher education; (c) government agency; (d) other; (e) total

Table 10-3a Type of First Position by Age and by Race

	Blacks											Whites										
	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)
Age (years)	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
71-80	0	-	8	88.9	-	-	1	11.1	-	-	9	1	25.0	3	75.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
61-70	1	7.1	8	57.1	-	-	4	28.6	1	7.1	14	4	19.0	16	76.2	1	4.8	-	-	-	-	21
51-60	1	3.1	28	87.5	1	3.1	2	6.3	-	-	32	13	20.6	42	66.7	5	7.9	-	-	3	4.8	63
41-50	4	10.3	24	61.5	3	7.7	7	17.9	1	2.6	39	7	8.0	67	76.1	9	10.2	2	2.3	3	3.4	88
31-40	7	10.1	42	60.9	8	11.6	8	11.6	4	5.8	69	16	12.2	100	76.3	6	4.6	3	2.3	6	4.6	131
21-30	1	14.3	1	14.3	3	42.9	1	14.3	1	14.3	7	2	15.4	9	69.2	-	-	1	7.7	1	7.7	13
Totals	14	8.2	111	65.3	15	8.8	23	13.5	7	4.1	170	43	13.4	234	74.1	21	6.6	6	1.9	13	4.1	320

(a) research; (b) teaching; (c) clinical work; (d) administration; (e) other; (f) total.

Table 10-3b Type of Current Position by Age and by Race

	Blacks											Whites										
Age (years)	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
71-80	-		1	50.0	-		-		1	50.0	2	2	50.0	2	50.0	-		-				4
61-70	1	9.1	7	63.6	1	9.1	1	9.1	1	9.1	11	2	10.5	14	73.7	-		3	15.8			19
51-60	-		18	56.3	1	3.1	12	37.5	1	3.1	32	9	14.5	34	54.8	2	3.2	10	16.1	7	11.3	62
41-50	5	12.8	26	66.7	1	2.6	4	10.3	3	7.7	39	12	13.6	48	54.5	8	9.1	13	14.8	7	7.9	88
31-40	15	21.4	35	50.0	4	5.7	10	14.3	6	8.6	70	23	17.7	82	63.1	5	3.8	8	6.1	12	9.2	130
21-30	0		3	42.9	1	14.3	3	42.9	-		7	2	15.4	9	69.2	-		2	15.4			13

(a) research; (b) teaching; (c) clinical work; (d) administration; (e) other; (f) total

Table 10-4a Predominant Race at College of First Employment by Age and by Race

Age (years)	Blacks (a) N	Blacks (a) %	Blacks (b) N	Blacks (b) %	Blacks (c) N	Whites (a) N	Whites (a) %	Whites (b) N	Whites (b) %	Whites (c) N
71-80	6	85.7	1	14.3	7	-		3	100.0	3
61-70	8	88.9	1	11.1	9	-		17	100.0	17
51-60	20	74.1	7	25.9	27	1	2.2	44	97.8	45
41-50	17	56.7	13	43.3	30	2	2.8	70	97.2	72
31-40	26	52.0	24	48.0	50	3	2.8	106	97.2	109
21-30	1	100.0	-		1	-		8	100.0	8
Totals	78	62.9	46	37.1	124	6	2.4	248	97.6	254

(a) predominantly black; (b) predominantly white; (c) total

10-

Table 4b Predominant Race at College of Current Employment by Age and by Race

	Blacks					Whites				
Age	(a)		(b)		(c)	(a)		(b)		(c)
(years)	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N
71-80	5	100.0	-		5	-		3	100.0	3
61-70	9	90.0	1	10.0	10	1	5.9	16	94.1	17
51-60	16	64.0	9	36.0	25	1	2.1	47	97.9	48
41-50	14	50.0	14	50.0	28	4	6.0	63	94.0	67
31-40	22	46.8	25	53.2	47	7	6.6	99	93.4	106
21-30	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	-		9	100.0	9
Totals	67	57.3	50	42.7	117	13	5.2	237	94.8	250

(a) predominantly black; (b) predominantly white; (c) total

Table 10-5a Rank of School of First Employment by Race and by Age

---

a. Blacks

Age (years)	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)		(g)		(h)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
71-80	-		1	14.3	4	57.1	2	28.6	-		-		-		7
61-70	-		-		5	55.6	4	44.4	-		-		-		9
51-60	2	7.4	-		18	66.7	7	25.9	-		-		-		27
41-50	-		1	3.6	11	39.3	10	35.7	3	10.7	1	3.6	2	7.1	28
31-40	3	6.1	-		15	30.6	21	42.9	3	6.1	2	4.1	5	10.2	49
21-30	-		-		-		1	100.0	-		-		-		1
Totals	5	4.1	2	1.7	53	43.8	45	37.2	6	5.0	3	2.5	7	5.8	121

(a) unranked; (b) noncompetitive; (c) less competitive; (d) competitive; (e) very competitive
(f) highly competitive; (g) most competitive; (h) total

228

Table 10-5b Rank of First College by Age and by Race

b. Whites

Age (years)	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)		(g)		(h)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
71-80	-		-		-		2	50.0	-		1	25.0	1	25.0	4
61-70	-	-	-		1	5.9	11	64.7	1	5.9	1	5.9	3	17.6	17
51-60	2	4.7	2	4.7	3	7.0	25	58.1	4	9.3	5	11.6	2	4.7	43
41-50	1	1.4	1	1.4	5	7.2	42	60.9	8	11.6	4	5.8	8	11.6	69
31-40	8	7.6	5	4.8	9	8.6	67	63.8	6	5.7	4	3.8	6	5.7	105
21-30	-		-		-		6	75.0	2	25.0	-		-		8
Totals	11	4.5	8	3.3	18	7.3	153	62.2	21	8.5	15	6.1	20	8.1	246

(a) unranked; (b) noncompetitive; (c) less competitive; (d) competitive; (e) very competitive
(f) highly competitive (g) most competitive; (h) total

Table 10-5c Rank of School of Current Employment by Race and by Age

---

c. Blacks

Age (years)	(a) N	(a) %	(b) N	(b) %	(c) N	(c) %	(d) N	(d) %	(e) N	(e) %	(f) N	(f) %	(g) N	(g) %	(h) N
71-80	-	-	-		3	75.0	1	25.0	-		-		-		4
61-70	-		1	10.0	4	40.0	4	40.0	-		-		1	10.0	10
51-60	-		2	8.0	15	60.0	6	24.0	2	8.0	-		-		25
41-50	-		-		11	36.7	15	50.0	1	3.3	3	10.0	-		30
31-40	-		-		16	35.6	21	46.7	2	4.4	2	4.4	4	8.9	45
21-30	1	33.3	-		1	33.3	1	33.3	-		-		-		3
Totals	1	0.9	3	2.6	50	42.7	48	41.0	5	4.3	5	4.3	5	4.3	117

(a) unranked; (b) noncompetitive; (c) less competitive; (d) competitive; (e) very competitive; (f) highly competitive; (g) most competitive; (h) total

230

Table 10-53 Rank of School of Current Employment by Race and by Age

d. Whites

Age (years)	(a) N	(a) %	(b) N	(b) %	(c) N	(c) %	(d) N	(d) %	(e) N	(e) %	(f) N	(f) %	(g) N	(g) %	(h) N
71-80	1	50.0	-		-		-		-		1	50.0	-		2
61-70	-		-		1	6.7	13	86.7	-		1	6.7	-		15
51-60	2	4.0	1	2.0	2	4.0	34	68.0	7	14.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	50
41-50	1	1.6	2	3.1	6	9.4	37	57.8	13	20.3	4	6.3	1	1.6	64
31-40	6	5.7	3	2.8	13	12.3	65	61.3	5	4.7	6	5.7	8	7.5	106
21-30	-		-		-		7	77.8	2	22.2	-		-		9
Totals	10	4.1	6	2.4	22	8.9	156	63.4	27	11.0	14	5.7	11	4.5	246

(a) unranked; (b) noncompetitive; (c) less competitive; (d) competitive; (e) very competitive
(f) highly competitive; (g) most competitive; (h) total

231

~~10-21~~

Table 10-1 First Job Rank for College Teachers by Age and Race

	Blacks											Whites										
Age (years)	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
71-80	-		-		-		2	28.6	5	71.4	7	-		3	100.0	-	-	-		-		3
61-70	-		2	25.0	2	25.0	2	25.0	2	25.0	8	1	5.6	7	38.9	7	38.9	2	11.1	1	5.6	18
51-60	-		5	20.8	10	41.7	6	25.0	3	12.5	24	1	2.2	15	33.3	21	46.7	7	15.6	1	2.2	45
41-50	1	3.6	5	17.9	16	57.1	6	21.4	-		28	1	1.4	17	23.6	46	63.9	6	8.3	2	2.8	72
31-40	1	2.3	7	16.3	27	62.8	8	18.6	-		43	6	5.6	16	15.0	81	75.7	4	3.7	-		107
21-30	-		1	100.0	-		-		-		1	1	11.1	1	11.1	7	77.8	-		-		9
Totals	2	1.8	20	18.0	55	49.5	24	21.6	10	9.0	111	10	3.9	59	23.2	162	63.8	19	7.5	4	1.6	254

(a) lecturer; (b) instructor; (c) assistant professor; (d) associate professor; (e) full professor
(f) total

Table 10-7 **Current Job Rank for College Teaching by Age and Race**

	Blacks											Whites										
	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)
Age (years)	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
71-80	1	25.0	-		-		-		3	75.0	4	-		-		-		-		3	100.0	3
61-70	-		2	22.2	1	11.1	1	11.1	5	55.6	9	-		-		-		-		17	100.0	17
51-60	-		-		2	9.5	5	23.8	14	66.7	21	-		-		3	6.1	8	16.3	38	77.5	49
41-50	-		-		6	20.7	11	37.9	12	41.4	29	-		1	1.6	5	7.8	14	21.9	44	68.8	64
31-40	-		-		23	54.8	15	35.7	4	9.5	42	4	3.8	-		35	33.3	47	44.8	19	18.1	105
21-30	-		1	33.3	2	66.7	-		-		3	2	20.0	-		7	70.0	1	10.0	-		10
Totals	1	0.4	3	1.2	34	13.7	32	12.9	38	15.3	108	6	2.4	1	0.4	50	20.2	70	28.2	121	48.8	248

(a) lecturer; (b) instructor; (c) assistant; (d) associate professor; (e) full professor
(f) total

233

3

Current Salary by Age and Race (in thousands)

Age (years)	Blacks									Whites								
	20		20-30		30-40		40-50		Total	20		20-30		30-40		40-50		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
71-80	1	50.0	-		1	50.0	-		2	-		-		1	100.0	-		1
61-70	3	42.9	1	14.3	1	14.3	2	28.6	7	-		3	33.3	3	33.3	3	33.3	9
51-60	-		5	33.3	7	46.7	3	20.0	15	4	10.8	10	27.0	14	37.8	9	24.3	37
41-50	4	19.0	9	42.9	6	28.6	2	9.5	21	5	10.4	23	47.9	16	33.3	4	8.3	48
31-40	13	33.3	16	41.0	7	17.9	3	7.7	39	30	38.0	40	50.6	6	7.6	3	3.8	79
21-30	-		1	50.0	1	50.0			2	7	87.5	1	12.5	-		-		8
Totals	21	24.4	32	37.2	23	26.7	10	11.6	86	46	25.3	77	42.3	40	22.0	19	10.4	182
Median	50.5 years		42.2 years		39.4 years		28.3 years			53.5 years		48.9 years		39.4 years		35.8 years		

Table 10-82 Current Job Satisfaction by Age and Race

Age (years)	Blacks							Whites						
	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
71-80	5	100.0	-		-		5	5	100.0	-		-		5
61-70	14	100.0	-		-		14	16	84.2	2	10.5	1	5.3	19
51-60	16	51.6	14	45.2	1	3.2	31	44	71.0	16	25.8	2	3.2	62
41-50	17	44.7	17	44.7	4	10.5	38	51	57.9	34	38.6	3	3.4	88
31-40	29	43.9	30	45.4	7	10.6	66	68	52.7	55	42.6	6	4.6	129
21-30	5	71.4	1	14.3	1	14.3	7	6	46.1	6	46.1	1	7.7	13
Totals	86	53.4	62	38.5	13	8.1	161	190	60.1	113	35.8	13	4.1	316

(a) very satisfied; (b) somewhat satisfied; (c) not satisfied; (d) total

Table 10-9b First Job Satisfaction by Age and Race

Age (years)	Blacks (a) N	Blacks (a) %	Blacks (b) N	Blacks (b) %	Blacks (c) N	Blacks (c) %	Blacks (d) N	Whites (a) N	Whites (a) %	Whites (b) N	Whites (b) %	Whites (c) N	Whites (c) %	Whites (d) N
71-80	7	77.8	2	22.2	-		9	5	100.0	-		-		5
61-70	7	50.0	6	42.9	1	7.1	14	11	52.4	10	47.6	-		21
51-60	13	44.8	13	44.8	3	10.3	29	39	61.9	21	33.3	3	4.8	63
41-50	20	54.1	14	37.8	3	8.1	37	44	55.0	31	38.7	5	6.3	80
31-40	25	38.5	38	58.5	2	3.1	65	60	48.0	54	43.2	11	8.8	125
21-30	1	14.3	5	71.4	1	14.3	7	3	25.0	8	66.7	1	8.3	12
Total	73	45.3	78	48.4	10	6.2	161	162	52.9	124	40.5	20	6.5	306

(a) very satisfied; (b) somewhat satisfied; (c) not satisfied; (d) total

Chapter 11

Black Graduates of Predominantly Black and of Predominantly White Colleges: A Comparative Analysis

In recent years, there has been an increased interest in whether the school from which one graduated makes a difference in terms of career (Solmon and Taubman, 1973). Our interest is in determining the career impact of an education received from a predominantly black or a predominantly white college. Most of the predominantly black colleges are located in the South, and for many years they provided the major opportunity for southern blacks to obtain higher education.

Criticism of black colleges by Jencks and Riesman (1967) had led to further studies that provide an analysis of the academic and social characteristics of these institutions (Thompson, 1973; Gurin and Epps, 1975; Willie and Edmonds, 1976). Sociologist Charles U. Smith accused Jencks and Riesman of stereotyping by lumping all black colleges together and not recognizing "the significant difference among the ... institutions" (Smith, 1976:195). For example, One of the authors discovered that one-tenth of the ~~1 out of every 10~~ alumni had an academic or professional doctorate in a predominantly black college in Georgia (Willie, 1976:12). Yet Jencks and Riesman would not rate any black institution above "the middle of the national academic procession" (Jencks and Riesman, 1967:25). Even in colleges characterized as open-door, John Monro discovered that "a serious percentage of [the] students are well above average in intellectual ability" and "are clearly able to handle demanding college work" (Monro, 1976:236). Thus, black colleges should not be stereotyped and collectively called "academic disaster areas," as Jencks and Riesman did several years ago (Jencks and Riesman, 1967:26), and neither should black students according to the findings of William Boyd II (Boyd, 1974:14).

The characterization of black colleges by Jencks and Riesman has been discounted and effectively rebutted. In fact, Riesman admitted that "much of what was said seemed to both its authors mistaken and only shortly after it was published" (Willie, 1981:94).

Our study, then, can carry the analysis to a new level and compare the racial characteristics of the undergraduate college by black scholars and the effect, if any, that it has had upon their careers. The findings from this analysis should not be generalized to all blacks. They are limited to those who specialize in the social sciences and humanities. Even generalization at this level should be approached with caution since our study involved only six prototype fields. Most blacks with M.A. and Ph.D. degrees attended predominantly white graduate schools. This study is concerned, however, only with the racial characteristics of the undergraduate school.

As seen in Table 11-1, over half of the blacks in the sample graduated from predominantly black colleges. They and their counterpart -- the 46.2% of blacks who graduated from predominantly white colleges -- are the study population for this analysis. By sex category, the participation of black scholars in predominantly black and predominantly white schools is similar; 55.2 percent of the males and 56.9 percent of the females attended predominantly black schools. A high proportion of blacks who were undergraduates in schools of both racial categories have doctoral degrees --68 percent of the graduates of predominantly black and 78 percent of the graduates of predominantly white schools.

Since only one white scholar in our study received a bachelor's degree from a predominantly black college, whites will not be included in this analysis. The fact that whites chose not to attend predominantly black colleges merits some attention. Although we have no data to determine the reasons so few whites attended predominantly black institutions, it is possible to speculate. Predominantly black institutions reflect on the segregatory history of race relations in the South. Prior to the Civil War, enslaved blacks were excluded by law from the pursuit of education. After the Civil War, missionaries and other groups established private predominantly black colleges to provide an education that would not otherwise have been available to blacks (Browning and Williams, 1978). When the doctrine of "separate but equal" was enunciated by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1896, these institutions and the predominantly black public colleges were limited to black students. Although attitudes toward racial segregation have changed dramatically in the South since the 1954 *Brown* decision, the data concerning white enrollment at predominantly black institutions suggest that sharing institutions that have been historically predominantly black has not yet been widely experienced by whites. Whether the absence of such experience has been due to persisting beliefs in "white supremacy" or an absence of knowledge of what these colleges have done and can do, we cannot determine with the data at hand.

It is important to note that predominantly black colleges are not exclusionary on the basis of race. Many were founded by whites and have continued to appoint whites and scholars of other races to their faculties. Kannerstein (1978) noted that one of the missions of predominantly black colleges is to improve race relations. Nor are some exclusionary in admissions. Many black colleges accept students with a range of qualifications based on past performance and attempt to improve their academic skills during the college years (Willie and MacLeish, 1976:132-148).

The analysis will focus first on the age of black scholars and the racial classification of the schools from which they graduated. Scholars 40 or under attended college in the post-Brown era and probably had a wider range from which to choose. Consequently, age is an important variable to study to determine if there are variations in the proportions of younger and older blacks who attended predominantly white colleges. This analysis is particularly important in the light of the prediction by Riesman and Jencks that ambitious blacks would probably bypass predominantly black schools in the era of desegregation (Riesman and Jencks, 1968:417).

Earlier we reported that a majority of the black scholars in the sample graduated from predominantly black schools, as seen in Table 11-1. We also noted, as shown in Table 11-2, that a majority of these scholars teach in predominantly black schools. These are not necessarily the same individuals. Not all black graduates of predominantly black schools teach in such settings, and not all black graduates of predominantly white colleges teach in schools of this racial classification. About one-quarter of the black faculty who graduated from black schools currently work at predominantly white schools, and slightly more than one-third of the black faculty currently employed in predominantly black schools have predominantly white alma maters.

To determine whether the racial composition of one's undergraduate college is associated with the career development of black professional scholars, the undergraduate school of matriculation will be held constant. Then variations, if any, in terms of the racial classification of the place of first and current appointment (Table 11-3), first and current rank (Table 11-4), and current salary (Table 11-5) will be analyzed. Likewise, the college of current appointment will be held constant and variations, if any, in the racial classification of the college of original matriculation will be determined. These analyses should enable us to determine whether black scholars who attended predominantly black colleges are more likely to teach as professionals in predominantly black or in predominantly white colleges. Of those who teach in predominantly white schools, our analysis should reveal whether their current rank and compensation vary by the racial classification of the college from which they graduated. We also can make a similar determination for black scholars who teach in predominantly black schools. From this analysis we can tell whether predominantly black schools and predominantly white schools tend to recruit or attract to them black scholars who have attended similar-type schools.

Age of Scholar and Undergraduate School

As mentioned in an earlier chapter, the black scholars in this study covered an age range of 49 years from ages 21 to 70; their median age was 46 years.

An analysis of the predominant race of the undergraduate college attended by age of the respondents reveals an inverse relationship between these two variables (Table 11-1). Those black scholars who were over 50 years old at the time of our study were more likely to have attended predominantly black colleges than predominantly white colleges. Those who were 41-50 years old were evenly divided between predominantly black and predominantly white colleges. Black scholars aged 31-40, who would have begun college in the post-*Brown* era in the late 1950s and during the

1960s, were more likely to have attended predominantly white colleges. Even this group, however, had a significant proportion that attended predominantly black colleges.

The overall pattern reveals that more younger scholars attended predominantly white colleges when compared with the college-going patterns of older scholars. In part, this is undoubtedly attributable to racial discrimination that prevented older blacks from attended predominantly white colleges.

The relatively large number of blacks of all ages, including the young, who attend predominantly white colleges also is due to the rapid acceleration in their college-going rate. In 1950, the number or blacks 25 years and over who had graduated from college was only 177,000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979:145). The National Center for Educational Statistics surveyed fall enrollments 1978 and found 1,054,325 blacks in all institutions of higher education (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1980:101).

Literally, it was impossible for this number of students to be accommodated by the 100 or so historically black colleges or the 144 predominantly black schools currently identified by the National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities (National Advisory Commission, 1979:13). The total system of higher education had to respond to the increased number and proportion of blacks who desired a college education. The number of blacks enrolled in historically black colleges also has increased since the Brown decision. Thus, the higher proportion of blacks now in predominantly white colleges compared with the proportion in pre-Brown years does not indicate a rejection of the historically black schools by blacks.

Our data reveal that 42 percent of the black scholars 40 years of age and under enrolled in predominantly black schools. A substantial proportion of younger black scholars has chosen to attend predominantly black colleges. Since legal barriers to attend predominantly white colleges had been removed, a proportion this size indicates that predominantly black colleges continued to be attractive learning environments for a significant number of blacks during the early decades of the age of official desegregation.

Black scholars as a group have had diversified educational experiences over the years. Even during the age of officially sanctioned segregation, about one-fourth of older scholars over 50 attended predominantly white colleges. Future studies of black college students may shed more light on the question of how blacks select their undergraduate colleges. The increased number of blacks seeking higher education, their careers and other life goals, as well as their past experiences are factors that should be included in such studies.

Our study suggests that when blacks have choices, as a group they will exercise them over a range of options and will participate in settings in which they are the majority or the minority. With reference to whites, however, our study reveals that they have been slow to accept the status and role of the minority in institutional settings that are predominantly black.

Employment Category, Teaching Rank, and Salary

The career patterns of those blacks who had attended predominantly black colleges differed in some important respects from the career patterns of those who attended predominantly white colleges. Employment category, teaching rank, and salary will be analyzed for black scholars with respect to the racial classification of the undergraduate school they attended, as seen in Table 11-3, 11-4, and 11-5. A majority of both groups began their careers in academic positions and remained in academic positions at the time of the study (see Table 11-3). That these individuals have been committed to a lifetime of scholarship is demonstrated by the fact that the proportion working in education currently varies less than 1 percent from the proportion that found employment in this sector immediately after graduate school. The proportions who currently work in academic settings in groups of blacks who graduated from both kinds of schools is similar -- slightly more than 7 out of every 10 who attended predominantly white schools, and slightly less than 7 out of every 10 who attended predominantly black schools.

Of blacks who held teaching positions at the college level, the largest proportion of both groups (graduates of predominantly black and predominantly white schools) began their careers at the rank of instructor or assistant professor: 61.3 percent of the blacks who attended predominantly black undergraduate colleges and 70.9 percent of the blacks who had attended predominantly white undergraduate colleges, as seen in Table 11-4. The slight difference in the above figures is perhaps a result of the larger proportion of the black graduates of predominantly black colleges who began their academic careers at the rank of full professor compared to black graduates of predominantly white colleges. Beginning an academic career at the high end of the teaching scale is different from the usual academic career pattern. A high proportion of graduates from predominantly black colleges returned to such schools as teachers. We know from the life-history analysis that predominantly black schools tend to be less concerned about restricting the rank of teachers at the beginning of their careers. We will be able to determine if our conjecture is fact in a later analysis that will hold the racial category of schools constant.

All current professorial ranks at the time of the study were remarkably similar for graduates of both types of colleges. Similar proportions of both groups fell into each teaching rank, including the rank of full professor, which was slightly more than one-third for each group, according to Table 11-4. A majority of both groups at the time of the study were associate professors and full professors. The slight head start that black graduates of predominantly white colleges had, particularly at the full-professor level, did not hold up through the years as careers developed.

The median current annual salary of blacks who graduated from predominantly white colleges was approximately $4,460 higher than the median of blacks who graduated from predominantly black colleges (Table 11-5). This difference means that black scholars who attended undergraduate schools where whites were a majority of the student body tended to earn in later years about one fifth more than blacks who attended predominantly black schools, despite the fact that no significant difference in rank was observed between the scholars in these two populations. Again, we suspect that this income difference is due to the fact that a higher proportion of black scholars who graduated from black undergraduate schools tended to return to such schools to teach. It is probable that the salary schedule in some predominantly black institutions of higher education is slightly lower than that in some predominantly white schools, thus accounting for the lower earnings in faculty in these schools.

The major difference in salary distribution for the black scholars who graduated from schools with different racial compositions is in the $30,000 to $40,000 category; nearly 14 percentage points separated the proportions in each group that attended different types of schools, and favored the black graduates of predominantly white schools. Few black faculty members who attended either predominantly black or predominantly white undergraduate schools earned $40,000 or more in 1980. This was the experience of about 1 out of every 10. Actually, black graduates of black schools were 2 percentage points ahead in the high income category; but this difference perhaps is insignificant. At the lower end of the salary scale for professional scholars, the proportion of black professors paid less than $30,000 a year ran about 12 percentage points higher among blacks who received an undergraduate education in black-controlled schools. Actually 66 percent of all these scholars earned less than $30,000, compared to 54 percent of black scholars educated in white-controlled schools.

In summary, the salary differential for black scholars educated in predominantly black and predominantly white undergraduate schools insignificantly favors the scholars who graduated from black-controlled colleges in the higher income range over $40,000. It is against predominantly black college graduates in the medium and lower income range of the salary schedule and, of course, in favor of graduates of predominantly white schools at these levels. Because the second and third salary levels include approximately 90 percent of all of the scholars, ~~(and the proportion of black scholar graduates of white controlled schools runs ahead of and behind graduates of racial minority controlled schools down in the second and third levels,~~

~~respectively, of the salary hierarchy)~~, the median salary for black scholars who graduate from predominantly white schools is nearly one-fifth higher than the median for others.

Earlier we speculated whether the higher proportion of full professors among graduates of predominantly black colleges was a function of a tendency for graduates of a particular kind of school to teach in a similar setting. We had evidence from the case studies that predominantly black institutions tend to be more liberal in granting higher ranks to individuals. Now, these data on salary also cause us to speculate whether predominantly black institutions pay relatively higher salaries to more individuals in the top category of the income hierarchy, but lag behind at other salary levels? The answer to this question should be manifested in a later analysis that examines salary and rank of black scholars by the racial category of the school that employs them.

Meanwhile, we shall conclude this analysis on outcome differences during a scholarly career between the graduates of two categories of schools with unique racial populations by briefly examining the salary data by age. Earlier we determined that younger black scholars under 40 years of age tended to graduate from predominantly white institutions of higher education more frequently than they graduated from other institutions, and that the reverse of this situation is true for older black scholars. By controlling for age we can discover whether salary differentials for blacks who attended schools of different racial compositions are functions of the kinds of schools attended or the particular years of matriculation.

Analysis of the median income in salaries by age for black scholars who graduated from predominantly black and predominantly white schools, as seen in Table 11-6, reveals great similarities between older scholars of these two groups and younger scholars of these two groups. A 4 percent difference in median annual salary favors the black graduates of white-controlled schools among scholars who are over 50 years of age. And an 8-percent difference in median annual salary favors the black graduates of black-controlled schools among the younger scholars under 40 years of age. These differences are modest and are of little consequence. At the middle-aged range 41-50 years, a $10,861 difference in median annual salary that favors black graduates of predominantly white schools for certain is significant; it represents a 45 percent increase in income of one group of scholars over the other group.

So the age difference in salaries for black graduates of the two different kinds of schools is confined largely to the age group that straddled the pre- and post-Brown eras. Black-scholar graduates of predominantly black schools during this transitional period did not substantially improve their income position over the earnings of younger scholars who graduated from similar schools. But black-scholar graduates who attended predominantly white schools during the first period that a real choice was available regarding the racial composition of the college one would attend, earned substantially more than their counterparts who remained in segregated schools. This salary difference in favor of graduates of predominantly white schools did not hold for the next generations of college students.

The salary differential observed for the 10-year age cohort that straddled the years of the Brown decisions of 1954 and 1955 may reflect personal characteristics of the individuals more than differences in the kinds of schools they attended. The persons who elected to attend an undergraduate school where they would be a minority when opportunity first became available could be the more assertive, daring, and adventurous individuals. Such personal characteristics if carried over in their work may have contributed to economic advancement, compared with others a bit more cautious and unwilling to be pioneers in a new predominantly white educational setting. Another possibility is that the salary differential for this age cohort that favors the black graduates of predominantly white schools may indeed reflect the employment networks in which the black students became enmeshed in these schools. And while no significant salary difference appears for the younger age cohort of black scholars who enrolled in predominantly black and predominantly white institutions for undergraduate study, in due time such diffferences could appear. The basis for this statement and the conjecture about the possible contribution of a predominantly white school to future employment opportunities is Willis Hawley's "tentative finding" that "students who have attended desegregated secondary schools are more likely to acquire higher-status jobs than those from segregated schools" (Hawley, 1981:153). Hawley explained that "since access to higher-status jobs seems to be significantly affected by interpersonal contact, attending a desegregated college may be an important source of social mobility for minorities" (Hawley, 1981:153).

A third explanation of the presence of a salary differential for the 41-50 years age group of black scholars but not for the younger age group under 40 years is presented. Despite the fact that both groups attended schools that varied by racial composition of student body, it is possible that the younger age group may be experiencing the effects of public law such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the affirmative-action requirement of it, as well as other laws, orders, and regulations that limit the power of whites. Thus, the preferred position of the majority population and whatever benefits were derived by blacks from association with such a group could be diminishing for the youngest age cohort.

With reference to the younger age group under 40 years there is an interesting salary fluctuation that should be mentioned. Both means and medians for the three age cohorts tend to increase and get larger in a direct association with age; older workers in the labor force tend to make more money than younger workers. This fact is true of all distributions except that of the means for black scholars by age who attended predominantly white schools. The distribution of mean salaries for the age cohort is indirectly associated with year of birth of black scholars in the labor force; younger black scholars have the highest mean salary; middle-age blacks are next, and older blacks last. Means, of course, are more unstable measures of central tendency than medians. The medians for these age cohorts follow the expected pattern with a direct association for all ages and both groups of black scholars.

The unique indirect association of income means and age cohorts for black scholars who are alumni of predominantly white schools is mentioned because these measures are probably influenced by a few younger blacks who make extraordinarily high salaries. In an earlier chapter it was mentioned that young blacks tend to earn higher salaries than young whites only if they are affluent. Moreover, the earlier analysis revealed that not all young blacks are affluent, that the affluent consist of about 13 percent of all the black scholars in this study. This small proportion presumably has such an impact that the mean salary for the under-40 age group is pulled to a level of $16,718 above the median salary for the same age cohort.

The reason for asserting that this small group of affluent young blacks who attended predominantly white undergraduate schools may be prospering because of their employment networks and contacts if our observation and analysis of young black scholars who graduated from predominantly black schools. Their multiple indicators of salary central tendencies are similar; and dispersion around a central tendency apparently is not great. The mean annual salary of black-scholar graduates of predominantly black schools was almost the same as the median, only $343 greater; and, of course, the mean salary for each age cohort increased as age increased. These data suggest that most younger blacks who graduated from predominantly black schools earned similar salaries. A few did not run far ahead of others, as did young black graduates of predominantly white schools.

Thus any conclusion that affirmative action has run its course and blacks are earning more money than whites of a similar age group should be qualified and limited only to affluent young blacks and then further qualified and limited largely to affluent young blacks who graduate from predominantly white schools. Such qualifications so far as affirmative action in the employment of black scholars is concerned mean that affirmative action has run its course for about 10 percent of black scholars in the social sciences and in the humanities. The progress of 90 percent should remain under surveillance.

Salary and Rank by Racial Category of School of Employment

Up to this point we have been analyzing the push effect of scholarly success. Essentially we were exploring in a gross way how the learning environment nurtured and equipped one to go forth and succeed.

Now we wish to turn our attention to the pull effect on scholarly success. What kinds of black scholars do institutions of higher education in the United States recruit? Are there differences in the kinds of scholars recruited by predominantly black and by predominantly white colleges? How do predominantly black and predominantly white institutions reward black scholars in terms of salary and rank? And finally, do these two kinds of schools make a distinction between black scholars who graduated from predominantly black and from predominantly white colleges? This analysis is undertaken because the differences that we observed earlier could be functions of the institution of undergraduate matriculation.

As seen in Table 11-2, black teaching scholars who graduate from predominantly black schools tend to return to teach in such schools. In our study, almost three-quarters of the scholars in the social sciences and in the humanities who graduated from predominantly black schools are currently employed at such schools; but one-quarter of them are employed at predominantly white schools. Of black faculty who graduated from predominantly white schools, just under two-thirds currently work at such schools and one-third do not. Obviously both kinds of schools have a pervasive effect on their graduates; but the predominantly black schools have a stronger holding power over their graduates by 10 percentage points compared with black graduates of predominantly white schools in inducing them to serve a school similar to the one from which they graduated. This fact tends to support the hypothesis that the best way to ensure a plentiful supply of minority candidates for service in one's own educational institution, or in other institutions similarly situated as one's own, is to "grow your own."

A comparison of those black scholars who came back to work in the kinds of schools from which they graduated with those who did not will provide some additional information concerning the impact of the predominant race of undergraduate college on career development. Concerning annual salary, black scholars who work in predominantly white colleges received a median salary that is one-fifth higher than the median received by black scholars who work in predominantly black academic settings (Table 11-7 a, b). The predominantly white institutions of higher education reward their black professors with higher income compared to what predominantly black institutions are willing to pay. But they are not so generous with academic rank (Table 11-8). Predominantly black schools appoint or promote almost twice as many faculty to the full professor level as do predominantly white institutions. The modal category for black faculty in predominantly white colleges is at the associate professor level. This finding contrasts with the modal category for black faculty in schools controlled by members of their own race, which, as noted above, is at the rank of professor.

We have shown that there are different working conditions in the different schools analyzed in this study. Predominantly white schools tend to pay black scholars higher salaries but give them lower professional rank. Predominantly black schools tend to pay black scholars lower salaries but give them higher professorial rank. The question remains, do these schools make distinctions between black scholars whom they hire in terms of their undergraduate educational experiences? To state the issue bluntly, do predominantly black and predominantly white colleges and universities pay their black teachers more or less depending on the schools from which they obtained their undergraduate degree, and do they award rank that varies according to their previous educational experience?

In terms of payment of black faculty in predominantly white schools, there is no salary differential associated with the racial composition of a scholar's undergraduate school. Blacks who graduated from predominantly black schools and blacks who graduated from predominantly white schools were equal in the salaries they earned when they joined the faculties of predominantly white schools; the median for both groups was $28,000.

In predominantly black schools, a salary difference is seen that correlates with the racial composition of the scholar's undergraduate school, and that favors black scholars who received their undergraduate education in predominantly white schools. The median salary of $35,000 that predominantly black schools pay their black scholars who studied for undergraduate degrees in predominantly white schools is 59 percent higher than the median of $22,001 paid to similar scholars and faculty members who graduated from predominantly black colleges and universities. The modal pay category (42.9%) for black professors at black colleges with B.A. degrees from predominantly white schools is $30,000 to $40,000 compared with a modal category (44.5%) under $20,000 for black professors at black colleges with B.A. degrees from predominantly black schools. On the basis of this finding, one must conclude that there is greater discrimination in pay of faculty within predominantly black schools depending on the predominant race of the undergraduate academy where the B.A. was obtained than there is in predominantly white schools, and that predominantly black schools favor graduates of predominantly white schools.

Predominantly black schools have been described as generous in granting high rank to their teachers (Table 11-8). To scholars on their faculty who went to predominantly white schools for undergraduate studies, these schools are extraordinarily generous. While at predominantly black schools less than half of the black faculty with a black college undergraduate background has an appointment as a full professor, this is the experience of almost two-thirds of their black faculty members who attended white-controlled schools as undergraduates.

As mentioned earlier, predominantly white colleges are less generous in awarding high rank to their black faculty members. Yet more than one-quarter of the black faculty in the humanities and social sciences in our study have attained the rank of full professor in a predominantly white college. This proportion embraces all black professors, those educated initially in either predominantly black or predominantly white schools. A modest degree of inequity appears in rank when black scholars from the two different educational backgrounds are compared. Unlike the predominantly black colleges, which favored blacks who graduated from white-controlled schools, the predominantly white colleges and universities favored in a modest way black scholars with predominantly black college backgrounds and tended to award them higher ranks.

While part of the difference in pay and in rank that predominantly black colleges award black faculty who are alumni of white-controlled schools may be attributed to the self-fulfilling prophecy of believing that predominantly white schools are better and then rewarding the graduates of such schools more generously, thereby confirming the belief, part of the difference also may be attributed to the characteristics of the individual scholars. Those inclined to seek out new situations unlike those to which they have become accustomed probably are the more assertive who, in the words of Shakespeare, are made of "sterner stuff." When such individuals who had roots in the black community and in predominantly black schools sought employment opportunities in predominantly white schools, they too were rewarded high rank compared with others who had longer experience in predominantly white settings, although no differential in income was observed.

Lending credence to the idea that the minority of black scholars who choose to work in an educational setting unlike the one they knew as young college students probably are more assertive and daring than those who return to what they already know is the finding that derives from a brief analysis of how the higher paid professors may maximize their opportunities. This is a cross-sectional and not a longitudinal analysis; thus, findings should be accepted with great caution as suggestive only.

About 22 percent of black professors in predominantly black schools who graduated from predominantly black schools earn $30,000 or more; but 38 percent of black professors in predominantly white schools who graduated from predominantly black schools earn salaries at this level. A black professor who was educated in a predominantly black school, then, has a greater probability of receiving a high salary if he or she teaches in a predominantly white school than in a predominantly black school.

About 44 percent of the black professors in predominantly white schools who earned undergraduate degrees in such schools are paid at the rate of $30,000 or above annually. But 57 percent of the black professors in predominantly white schools who graduated from predominantly black schools earn salaries at this level and above. Thus, the probability that a black scholar with a predominantly white alma mater will receive a high salary is increased if he or she teaches in a predominantly black school.

Therefore, a black scholar with college roots in the black community may increase his or her probability of earning a higher salary by working in a setting unlike the one in which he grew to maturity. Likewise, a black scholar with college roots in the white community may increase his or her probability of earning a high salary by working in a setting unlike the one in which he or she grew to maturity. Clearly the majority of black scholars appear to prefer to work in educational settings that are similar to those they experienced as undergraduates. Only a minority is willing to risk the crossover experience. That minority tends to be rewarded for daring to teach in either a predominanlty black or a predominantly white setting.

Rank of Colleges that Recruit Black Scholars

Another kind of analysis also having to do with the pull effect is the rank of a school among other colleges and universities. Specifically we asked: What kinds of predominantly white institutions of higher education tend to recruit black faculty? We used the ranking system in Barron's *Profile of American Colleges* (BES, 1978). It has six categories: noncompetitive, less competitive, competitive, very competitive, highly competitive, and most competitive. The categories take into account standardized test scores (SAT or ACT) for the most recent freshman class, grade-point average, class rank in high school, and proportion of applicants admitted to those applying for admission to the school. A ranking system based in part on strandardized test scores does not acknowledge the various goals and purposes of many institutions of higher education and is certain to be controversial. Such a ranking system is of doubtful validity as a universal indicator of quality of education. Yet Barron's ratings are used widely.

Given the factors used in Barron's system and the diversity of goals and purposes of institutions, particularly those that serve large populations of racial minority students, it is not surprising that approximately 9 out of every 10 predominantly black institutions are ranked as less competitive or noncompetitive as seen in Table 11-9. Yet these schools are the alma maters for a substantial proportion of the blacks who teach in predominantly white colleges and universities. Thus Barron's ratings do not indicate the capacity of a school to provide an educational foundation for future scholars who may serve at all levels in the academic hierarchy in all colleges, including those of [redacted] high and low rank.

Since Barron's system is so widely acknowledged, it may be of interest to rank the predominantly white schools that employ black professors by it. Our goal is to determine where these schools fit in a hierarchy or ranking system devised not by blacks but representatives of the majority. For example, are the predominantly white colleges and universities that recruit black faculty most competitive, competitive, or noncompetitive? Of all predominantly white colleges and universities rated by Barron, the mean, median, and mode of the distribution are found in the category of competitive which includes 51 percent of the schools; about 35 percent are less competitive or noncompetitive; and 13 to 14 percent are highly competitive, very competitive, or most competitive (Table 11-9).

As stated earlier, slightly more than a third of the black scholars who pursued academic careers taught in predominantly white colleges shortly after receiving their terminal degree; currently, however, just above two-fifths teach in such schools.

The four categories that range from competitive to most competitive include 68 percent of the white schools (Table 11-9), but 85 percent of the black scholars currently teach in institutions in which the student body is of a racial population predominantly different from their own (Table 11-4). Only one-sixth of the black professors in predominantly white schools teach in schools that Barron rated as less competitive or lower. Blacks are not randomly distributed among colleges and universities but are disproportionately pulled to higher status institutions when they accept appointments in predominantly white rather than predominantly black schools.

We know that there is a tendency for individuals to work in settings that are similar to those that they experienced earlier. This phenomenon does not explain the disproportionate number of blacks in schools that are ranked high at the level of competitive and above. While some may have graduated from such schools, at least a third of all black teachers in the humanities and social sciences who teach in predominantly white schools graduated from predominantly black schools (Table 11-10), 93 percent of which were ranked as less competitive or lower (Table 11-9). Thus, the blacks from these schools who joined faculties of competitive or very competitive predominantly white schools probably were pulled into the new settings either because of the educational value that these competitive schools placed on racial diversity within the faculty, or because these schools were more vulnerable to the penalties of public law if they failed to implement affirmative-action hiring policies, or because black scholars perceived predominantly white competitive and very competitive schools to be more desirable settings in which to work compared with less competitive and noncompetitive predominantly white schools.

There is evidence that the elite, predominantly white colleges and universities now value racial diversity in their faculties in addition to other reasons that may lie behind their recruitment of black faculty and other professionals. While only 6.2 percent of the predominantly white institutions rated by Barron are ranked at the two highest levels (Table 11-9), 17.4 percent of all black faculty members in predominantly white institutions are in highly competitive or most competitive schools. These schools have disproportionately recruited blacks by a factor of nearly three compared to their proportion in the distribution of all schools.

While racial diversity appears to be of value in the faculty recruitment strategy of highly competitive and most competitive institutions, these schools more readily will accept black faculty members if they graduated from predominantly white schools. In our study, graduates of predominantly black colleges served on faculties of predominantly white competitive and very competitive schools; but none from this source was on the social sciences or humanities faculties of the highly competitive or most competitive schools. Blacks on such faculties all had undergraduate degrees from schools with student bodies that were similar to the predominantly white schools.

Among less competitive, noncompetitive, or unranked predominantly white colleges in our study there is an underrepresentation of black faculty members compared to the proportion of such schools in the distribution of all predominantly white schools in the Barron population. Nearly a third of the Barron schools fall in the bottom two ranks (Table 11-9); but only one-sixth of the black faculty in predominantly white schools in our study were employed by such institutions. These predominantly white schools of low rank and prestige are not so concerned about the kinds of undergraduate schools from which their faculty graduated; they have black faculty who attended predominantly black and predominantly white colleges. To come up to par the low-ranked white schools would have to double the proportion of all blacks who teach in predominantly white schools that they now have. Since the racial classification of a black faculty member's undergraduate school seem not to matter, it would appear that the predominantly white low status schools have disproportionately low numbers of all blacks who teach in white settings either because racial diversity of the faculty is not a high priority or blacks chose not to accept appointments that were offered. Because some blacks have joined the faculties of these schools and the numbers, although small, are similar for blacks who obtained baccalaureate degrees from predominantly black and predominantly white colleges, one is led to believe that racial diversity is a lower priority for such schools and that this accounts for their disproportionately low number of black faculty members.

Table 11-1 Predominant Race of Colleges Where Black Scholars Obtained B.A. Degrees

Age (Years)	Number		Percent by Age		Percent by College		
	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(c)
71-80	7	3	7.7	3.9	70.0	30.0	100.0
61-70	11	3	12.1	3.9	78.6	21.4	100.0
51-60	23	8	25.2	10.5	74.2	25.8	100.0
41-50	19	19	20.9	25.0	50.0	50.0	100.0
31-40	29	38	31.9	50.1	43.3	56.7	100.0
21-30	2	5	2.3	6.6	28.6	71.4	100.0
Totals	91	76	100.0	100.0	54.5	45.5	100.0

(a) predominantly black; (b) predominantly white; (c) total

Table 11-2 Predominant Race of Colleges Where Black Scholars Obtained B.A. by Predominant Race of College Employment (Percentage across)

Predominant Race of Undergraduate College	First Postdoctoral Position					Current Position				
	(a)		(b)		(c)	(a)		(b)		(c)
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	
Black	58	79.5	15	20.5	73	50	74.6	17	25.4	67
White	21	42.0	29	58.0	50	17	35.4	31	64.6	48
Totals	79	64.2	44	35.8	123	67	58.3	48	41.7	115

(a) predominantly black college; (b) predominantly white college; (c) total

262

Table 11-3 Employment Category of Black Scholars by Predominant Race of College where B.A. Was Obtained

Predominant Race of Undergraduate College	First Postdoctoral Position					Current Position				
	Academic		Nonacademic		Total	Academic		Nonacademic		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N
Black	67	72.8	25	27.2	92	65	73.0	24	27.0	89
White	50	67.6	24	32.4	74	51	68.9	23	31.1	74
Totals	117	70.5	49	29.5	166	116	71.2	47	28.8	163

Table 11-4 Employment Rank of Black Scholars by Predominant Race of College Where B.A. Was Obtained

Predominant Race of Undergraduate College	First Postdoctoral Position											Current Position										
	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%			N	%	
Black	1	1.6	10	16.1	28	45.2	14	22.6	9	14.5	62	1	1.7	1	1.7	18	30.5	16	27.1	23	38.9	59
White	1	2.1	8	16.7	26	54.2	11	22.9	2	4.2	48	0	-	1	2.2	14	30.4	14	30.4	17	37.0	46

(a)lecturer; (b) instructor; (c) assistant professor; (d) associate professor; (e) full professor; (f) total

Table 11-5 Current Salary of Black Scholars by Predominant Race of College where B.A. Was Obtained

Predominant Race of Undergraduate College	≤ $20,000		$20,001-30,000		$30,001-40,000		$40,001-50,000		Total	Mean	Median
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N		
Black	12	25.5	19	40.4	10	21.3	6	12.8	47	$27,642	$24,040
White	7	18.9	13	35.1	13	35.1	4	10.8	37	$37,186	$28,500
Totals	19	22.6	32	38.1	23	27.4	10	11.9	84		

Table 11-6 Current Salary by Age by Predominant Race of College where B.A. Was Obtained

	Predominantly Black Undergraduate Colleges			Predominantly White Undergraduate Colleges		
Age (years)	N	Mean	Median	N	Mean	Median
≤40	18	$24,287	$23,944	22	$38,818	$22,100
41-50	12	$26,097	$24,000	9	$34,861	$35,000
over 50	18	$31,941	$30,137	6	$34,687	$31,440

Table 11-7 Current Salary of Black Scholars by Racial Category of College Where B.A. Was Obtained

a. Black Scholars Employed in Predominantly Black Colleges

Predominant Race of Undergraduate School	Current Salary								Total		Median
	$20,000		$20,001-$30,000		$30,001-$40,000		$40,001-$50,000				
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Black	12	44.5	9	33.3	3	11.1	3	11.1	27	100.0	$22,001
White	2	28.5	1	14.3	3	42.9	1	14.3	7	100.0	$35,000
Totals	14	41.2	10	29.4	6	17.6	4	11.8	34	100.0	$23,000

b. Black Scholars Employed in Predominantly White Colleges

Predominant Race of Undergraduate School	Current Salary								Total		Median
	$20,000		$20,001 $30,000		$30,001 $40,000		$40,001 $50,000				
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Black	-	-	5	62.5	3	37.5	-	-	8	100.0	$28,000
White	3	18.7	6	37.5	6	37.5	1	6.3	16	100.0	$28,000
Totals	3	12.5	11	45.8	9	37.5	1	4.2	24	100.0	$28,000

Table 11-8 Current Employment Rank of Black Scholars by Racial Category of College From Which B.A. Was Obtain[illegible]

a. Black Scholars Employed in Predominantly Black Colleges

Predominant Race of Undergraduate School	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Black	-	-	1	2.6	13	34.2	8	21.1	16	42.1	38	100.0
White	-	-	-	-	3	18.8	3	18.8	10	62.4	16	100.0
Totals	-	-	1	1.9	16	29.6	11	20.4	26	48.1	54	100.0

b. Blacks Scholars in Predominantly White Colleges

Predominant Race of Undergraduate School	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Black	-	-	-	-	3	18.8	8	49.9	5	31.3	16	100.0
White	-	-	-	-	11	37.9	11	37.9	7	24.2	29	100.0
Total	-	-	-	-	14	31.1	19	42.2	12	26.7	45	100.0

(a) lecturer; (b) instructor; (c) assistant professor; (d) associate professor; (e) full professor; (f) total

Table 11-9 Barron's Ratings of Colleges

Ratings	Predominantly Black Colleges		Predominantly White Colleges		All Colleges	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Most Competitive	-	-	34	2.6	34	2.5
Very Competitive	-	-	47	3.6	47	3.4
Highly Competitive	-	-	101	7.8	101	7.3
Competitive	6	7.1	699	54.2	705	51.2
Less Competitive	74	88.1	339	26.2	413	30.0
Non-Competitive	4	4.8	72	5.6	76	5.5
Totals	84	100.0	1,292	100.0	1,376	99.9

Table 11-10 Ranking of College of Current Employment for Blacks Who Currently Work in Predominantly White Colleges by Race of College Where B.A. Was Obtained

Predominant Race of Undergraduate College	Rank of College of Current Employment														
	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)		(g)		(h)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Black	0	-	2	11.8	1	5.9	10	58.8	4	23.5	0	-	0	-	17
White	1	3.4	1	3.4	2	6.9	16	55.2	1	3.4	4	13.8	4	13.8	29
Totals	1	2.2	3	6.5	3	6.5	26	56.5	5	10.9	4	8.7	4	8.7	46

(a) unranked; (b) noncompetitive; (c) less competitive; (d) competitive; (e) very competitive; (f) highly competitive; (g) most competitive; (h) total

270

Table 11-10 Ranking of College of Current Employment by Predominant Race of College Where B.A. Was Obtained (Blacks Only)

Predominant Race of Undergraduate College	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)		(g)		(h)
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Black	0	-	2	2.9	39	57.4	23	33.8	4	5.9	0	-	0	-	68
White	1	2.1	1	2.1	10	21.3	24	51.1	1	2.1	5	10.6	5	10.6	47
Totals	1	0.9	3	2.6	49	42.6	47	40.9	5	4.3	5	4.3	5	4.3	115

(a) unranked; (b) noncompetitive; (c) less competitive; (d) competitive; (e) very competitive; (f) highly competitive; (g) most competitive; (h) total

Chapter 12

Similarities and Differences Between Five Outstanding Black Scholars and a National Sample of Scholars

We determine now whether the five outstanding black scholars are similar to or different from other scholars in a national sample who ranked them. This analysis enables us to state specifically the characteristics, if any, that differentiate outstanding scholars from others in the fields. The analysis will examine ascribed characteristics such as age, sex, and region of birth, and acquired characteristics such as education and employment experiences. Also family background factors, for example the education and occupation of parents, will be examined to determine whether these are associated with professional achievement and, if so, how.

Ascribed Characteristics

All five outstanding black scholars are classified as male. As a group, they are unlike the sample population of black scholars in which men and women are more equally distributed (three-fifths to two-fifths). The all-male group of outstanding black scholars is closer to the sex distribution in the sample of white scholars that is four-fifths male and one-fifth female.

With a mean age of 59 years, the outstanding black scholars are seasoned individuals most of whom have experienced more than six decades of living. Time apparently is an important component in the achievement of outstanding professional status in the humanities and the social sciences; these have been called wisdom fields. The average age of the outstanding black scholars is approximately one and one-half decades beyond that of the sample of black and of white scholars. In terms of age and experience, the outstanding black scholars differed from the other scholars studied.

Most of the black scholars in the national sample were born in the South and most of the white scholars were born in the North. The five outstanding scholars were unlike the scholars in minority or majority groups in terms of region of birth; one was northern-born, two were southern-born, and two were born outside the United States. Neither the South nor the North could claim a majority of the outstanding black scholars as native sons. Their region of birth revealed them to be a cosmopolitan conglomeration unlike either blacks or whites in the sample.

Achieved Characteristics

The scholars in our study received extensive education; 72 percent of the blacks and 91 percent of the whites had earned doctoral degrees. All five of the outstanding black scholars, however, had Doctor of Philosophy degrees. This means, their educational attainment was closer to that of the sample of white scholars and more deviant from that of other blacks.

As a group, the outstanding black scholars also were cosmopolitan in their experience of undergraduate educational settings. Their schools had student bodies that ranged from predominantly black to predominantly white; three scholars received bachelor's degrees from predominantly white colleges and two from predominantly black colleges. In the sample of other black scholars, nearly three-fifths graduated from predominantly black schools and slightly more than two-fifths from predominantly white schools. Although the racial composition of the alma mater that most blacks in the national sample attended was the reverse of that experienced by most of the outstanding black scholars, as groups these two collectivities had similar cosmopolitan experiences matriculating in undergraduate schools that were diversified in terms of range of racial composition of the student body. In this experience, the outstanding black scholars were similar to blacks in the sample and different from the sample of whites, 99 percent of whom had homogeneous racial encounters in undergraduate institutions that were predominantly white.

The outstanding black scholars, like other blacks in the sample, have taught in a range of schools in terms of racial composition of the student body. Two of the five received initial faculty appointments in predominantly black schools. Currently all five teach or recently taught in predominantly white schools. Initial appointments in predominantly black and predominantly white schools was an experience that the outstanding blacks, as a group, shared with the sample of black scholars.

The current or most recent teaching station for all outstanding black scholars is on predominantly white college campuses. This experience they have in common with the sample of white scholars who currently teach almost exclusively in such schools. Teaching in predominantly white schools currently or in recent years, and studying or teaching in predominantly black schools in the past, the outstanding black scholars have been exposed to all sorts of cultural groups. As a group, their interracial experiences are similar to those of other blacks but more inclusive in that each individual has had extensive experiences in intraracial and interracial settings; their interracial experiences as a group and as individuals differ greatly from those of whites in the sample who have experienced more or less homogeneous and exclusive racial encounters with people who have characteristics and customs that are similar to their own. One could classify the extraordinary cosmopolitan experiences that all outstanding black scholars have had in predominantly black and in predominantly white settings as a unique personal experience that probably has contributed to their unique professional status.

Family Background Factors

Finally, we analyze family background factors to determine whether there is an intergenerational effect. Our primary concern is with the education and occupation of parents.

Studies reviewed in chapter 1 reported little intergenerational correlation between the achievement of black offspring and the achieved characteristics of their parents. Most studies limit analysis to intergenerational effects, if any, between offspring and father. Our study will examine the association, if any, between education and occupation of mother and father and achievement of offspring.

Coleman and Rainwater's study reported in chapter 1 found that most Americans believe that the most important ways for a person to improve his social standing in this nation are to obtain a better education, work hard, be ambitious, and receive encouragement from parents. The case studies clearly reveal that the outstanding scholars followed all four routes; they certainly were encouraged by their parents. This analysis is to determine whether the achievements of the parents had a direct effect upon the achievement of offspring.

The parents of outstanding black scholars had a mixed educational history ranging from 1 father and 1 mother who did not complete high school to 1 father and 1 mother who had degrees from graduate school.

Despite this wide range, most parents of these scholars were high school graduates; this was the experience of 4 of the 5 fathers and 4 of the 5 mothers. In educational attainment, these parents were ahead of but closer to the norm of the parents of white scholars among whom 7 of every 10 mothers and fathers were high school graduates compared with parents of other black scholars among whom only 5 of every 10 mothers and fathers were high school graduates.

Limiting the analysis to higher education, 2 of the 5 fathers and 1 of the 5 mothers were college graduates among parents of the outstanding black scholars. This educational experience was not dissimilar from that of parents of other scholars in the sample among whom one-fifth to nearly two-fifths of their parents were college graduates. The proportion of parents who had graduated from college in all three study groups was higher than that for the nation.

In general, the level of educational attainment for the parents of all scholars lagged behind the educational attainment of their offspring. However, it was ahead of the national norm for all adults over 25 years of age. Moreover, the level of educational attainment of parents of outstanding black scholars was ahead of that for the parents of other scholars in the national sample.

Clearly, outstanding scholarship among black offspring is associated with enhanced education among parents. An interesting fact about the educational attainment of parents of all scholars is the similarity in amount of education received by mothers and fathers in each household. This fact may have as much to do with the scholarly achievements of the offspring as the relatively high level of education attained by their parents.

With reference to employment, a major difference between the population of outstanding black scholars and the sample of other scholars had to do with the labor force experience of their mothers. All mothers of outstanding black scholars had worked; 3 of the 5 were employed as professional workers. Their experience was different from the mothers of other black scholars and of white scholars in the sample among whom nearly two-fifths to nearly three-fifths, respectively, were housekeeping spouses.

Of white scholars whose mothers worked, most had professional or clerical jobs. But the mothers of other black scholars who worked were about equally distributed between professional and clerical jobs, on the one hand, and skilled and unskilled jobs, on the other. The kinds of jobs that the mothers of outstanding black scholars had were not much different from the kinds of jobs held by mothers of other black scholars in the sample. The major difference between these two populations was the proportion of mothers in the labor force -- all of the mothers of outstanding black scholars versus two-thirds of the mothers of other black scholars. However, a majority of the mothers in both groups of black scholars worked; in this respect, they had different labor force experiences than the mothers of white scholars among whom a majority did not work.

Of fathers of outstanding black scholars, 4 of the 5 had white-collar occupations. In this respect, they were similar to the sample of white fathers among whom 7 of every 10 were white-collar workers, and unlike the fathers of other blacks in the sample among whom 3 to 4 of every 10 were white-collar workers. In summary, a majority of outstanding black scholars and white scholars in the sample had fathers who held professional jobs compared to the fathers of other black scholars, a majority of whom were unskilled workers.

A better education, hard work, and ambition would appear to be not only a characteristic of the outstanding black scholars but also a characteristic of their mothers and fathers. They appear to transmit these values to their offspring by encouraging them in extraordinary ways. The fact that mothers can participate in this process fully because of their educational and labor-force experiences may be the critical resource that propels the outstanding black scholars toward their extraordinary achievement. This analysis indicates that attention should be given to the circumstances and conditions of both parents and the effects of these, if any, upon achievement and other outcomes of offspring. Certainly the kinds of activities participated in by mothers of outstanding black scholars in our study seem to be one experience that differentiates their families from those of other scholars.

Summary and Conclusion

The outstanding black scholars are similar to [redacted] white scholars in the sample in the sex composition of their group, in their level of educational attainment, and in their schools of current or most recent employment. All five are male; all earned the Doctor of Philosophy degree; and all currently or most recently taught in predominantly white schools.

The educational and employment histories of outstanding black scholars in terms of racial composition of school attended and racial composition of institution of first professional appointment are similar to those of other black scholars in the sample. Three-fifths in one group received baccalaureate degrees from predominantly white schools and three-fifths in the other group graduated from predominantly black schools. Three-fifths in one group received first professional appointments in predominantly white schools; and three-fifths in the other group received first professional appointments in predominantly black schools. The similarity is that both groups had members who attended and first worked in institutions that ranged in racial composition from predominantly white to predominantly black.

In terms of parental background factors the levels of educational and occupational attainment of the fathers of outstanding black scholars was similar to that of white scholars in the sample; a high proportion were college graduates and professional workers.

The outstanding black scholars differed from both black scholars and white scholars in the sample in the educational and occupational experiences of their mothers, in the cosmopolitan character of their personal experences, and in age or maturity. Most mothers of the outstanding black scholars were in the labor force and worked in professional or skilled jobs, had attended college, and had an education equal to that of their husbands. The five outstanding scholars worked in nation-states or in regions within a country that were different from those in which they were born. In addition, most of them had extensive interracial and intraracial experiences derived from living in predominantly black and in predominantly white communities and working in predominantly black and in predominantly white schools. The humanities and social sciences are [redacted] fields in which wisdom [redacted] or maturity is something of value. The outstanding black scholars had lived six decades or more and had gained a perspective on the problems in their fields that one may obtain only with age.

References

Allport, Floyd A. 1955. *Theories of Perception and the Concept of Structure*. New York: Wiley.

BES. 1978. *Profile of American Colleges*. Woodbury, N.Y.: Barron's Educational Services.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. 1976. *Schooling in Capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books.

Boyd, II, William M. 1974. *Desegregating America's Colleges*. New York: Praeger.

Brown v. *Board of Education*. 1954. 347 U.S. 483.

Browning, Jame E. Smith and John B. Williams. 1978. "History and Goals of Black Institutions of Higher Learning." Pp. 68-93 in Charles V. Willie and Ronald R. Edmonds (eds.), *Black Colleges in America*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Clark, Kenneth B. 1940. "Some Factors Influencing the Remembering of Prose Materials." *Archives of Psychology* 253:1-73.

Clark, Kenneth B. 1951. *Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development*. Washington, D.C.: Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth.

Clark, Kenneth B. 1955. *Prejudice and Your Child*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Clark, Kenneth B. 1965. *Dark Ghetto*. New York: Harper.

Clark, Kenneth B. 1972. *A Possible Reality*. New York: Emerson Hall.

Clark, Kenneth B. 1974 *Pathos of Power*. New York: Harper & Row.

Clark, Kenneth B. 1978. "Kenneth B. Clark." Pp. 76-84 in Thomas C. Hunter (ed.), *Beginnings*. New York: Crowell.

Clark, Kenneth B., and Mamie P. Clark. 1947. "Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children." Pp. 169-178 in Theodore M. Newcomb and Eugene Hartley (eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology*. New York: Holt.

Coleman, Richard P., and Lee Rainwater. 1978. *Social Standing in America*. New York: Basic Books.

DuBois, W. E. B. 1903. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Chicago: Clury.

Duncan, Beverly, and Otis Duncan. 1970. "Family Stability and Occupational Success." Pp. 156-177 in Charles V. Willie (ed.), *The Family Life of Black People*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.

Elam, J. Corene. 1981. Review of The Wayward and the Seeking (Darwin T. Turner (ed.)). Journal of Negro History LXVI (Spring):55-56.

Evans, Richard I. 1980. The Making of Social Psychology. New York: Gardner Press.

Franklin, John Hope. 1938. "Edward Bellamy and the Naturalist Movement." New England Quarterly (December).

Franklin, John Hope. 1956. The Militant South. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Franklin, John Hope. 1960. "As for Our History." Pp. 3-18 in Charles Grier Sellers, Jr. (ed.), The Southerner as American. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Franklin, John Hope. 1967. The Negro in the Twentieth Century. New York: Vintage Books.

Franklin, John Hope. 1974. From Slavery to Freedom. New York: Knopf. 4th ed. Originally published 1947.

Franklin, John Hope and Isidore Starr. 1967. The Negro in Twentieth Century America. New York: Vintage Books.

Freeman, Richard B. 1976a. The Over-Educated American. New York: Academic Press.

Freeman, Richard B. 1976b. Black Elite. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goode, William J. 1973. Explorations in Social Theory. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gurin, Patricia, and Edgar Epps. 1975. Black Consciousness, Identity and Achievement. New York: Wiley.

Hauser, Robert, and David Featherman. 1977. The Process of Stratification. New York: Academic Press.

Hawley, Willis D. 1981. "Increasing the Effectiveness of School Desegregation: Lessons from Research." Pp. 145-162 in Race and Schooling in the City. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Health Resources Administration. 1977. An Exploratory Evaluation of U.S. Medical Schools' Efforts to Achieve Equal Representation of Minority Students. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Heiss, Jerold. 1975. The Case of the Black Family. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hoffer, Eric. 1963. The Ordeal of Change. New York: Harper and Row.

Holden, Matthew Jr. 1958a. County Government in Ohio. Cleveland: Metropolitan Service Commission.

Holden, Matthew Jr. 1958b. Inter-Governmental Agreements in the Cleveland Metropolitan Area. Cleveland: Cleveland Metropolitan Service Commission.

Holden, Matthew Jr. 1963. "Litigation and the Political Order." Western Political Quarterly 16 (December):771-781.

Holden, Matthew Jr. 1966. Pollution Control as a Bargaining Process: An Essay on Regulatory Decision-Making. Ithaca: Cornell University Water Resource Center.

Holden, Matthew Jr. 1968. "On the Misunderstanding of Important Phenomena." Urban Affairs Quarterly IV (September).

Holden, Matthew Jr. 1971. "Black Politicians in the Time of the 'New' Urban Politics." The Review of Black Political Economy 2, no. 1.

Jencks, Christopher, et al. 1972. Inequality. New York: Basic Books.

Jencks, Christopher and David Riesman. 1967. "The American Negro College." Harvard Educational Review 37 (Winter), pp. 3-60.

Jones, Mary Cover. 1960. "The Later Careers of Boys Who Were Early or Late-Maturing." In J. M. Seidman (ed.), The Adolescent. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Kannerstein, Gregory. 1978. "Black Colleges: Self-Concept." Pp. 29-50 in Charles V. Willie and Ronald R. Edmonds (eds.), Black Colleges in America. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kriesberg, Louis. 1968. "Intergenerational Patterns of Poverty." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society, Boston, Mass., April 6.

Landes, David S., and Charles Tilly (eds.). 1971. History as Social Science. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Lehman, Harvey C. 1946. "The Age of Starting to Contribute Versus Total Creative Output." Journal of Applied Psychology 30:460-468.

Levinson, Daniel J. 1978. The Season's of a Man's Life. New York: Ballantine Books.

Lewis, W. Arthur. 1954. Economic Problems of Today.

Lewis, W. Arthur. 1955. The Theory of Economic Growth. Homewood, Ill.: Richard I. Irwin.

Lewis, W. Arthur. 1966a. Development Planning. London: George Allen and Univin.

Lewis, W Arthur. 1966b. The Politics of Africa.

Lewis, W. Arthur. 1967. Reflections on Nigeria's Economic Growth. Paris: Development Centre of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Lewis, W. Arthur. 1969a. Some Aspects of Economic Development.

Lewis, W. Arthur. 1969b. Aspects of Tropical Trade 1883-1965.

Lieberson, Stanley, and Donna K. Carter. 1979. "Making It in America: Differences Between Eminent Black and White Ethnic Groups." American Sociological Review 44 (June):347-366.

Merton, Robert K. 1968. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

Mitchell, G. Duncan. 1968. A Hundred Years of Sociology. Chicago: Aldine.

Monro, John. 1978. "Teaching and Learning English." Pp. 235-260 in Charles V. Willie and Ronald R. Edmonds (eds.), Black Colleges in America. New York: Teachers College Press.

Moore, Harry T. 1971. "Preface." Pp. vii-xi in Darwin T. Turner (author), In a Minor Chord. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press.

Nagel, Stuart S. 1975. "Series Editor's Introduction." In Matthew Holden, Jr. and Dennis L. Dresang (eds.), What Government Does. Beverly Hills: Sage.

National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities. 1979. Access of Black Americans to Higher Education: How Open is the Door? Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Center for Education Statistics. 1980. Digest of Education Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Newman, Dorothy K., Nancy J. Am'dei, Barbara L. Carter, Dawn Day, William J. Kruvant, and Jack S. Russell. 1978. Protest, Politics and Prosperity. New York: Pantheon Books.

Odegaard, Charles E. 1977. Minorities in Medicine. New York: The Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation.

Peirce, Neal. 1981. "The 'NIMBY' Syndrome." Boston Globe (September 28), p. 14.

Phi Delta Kappa, Inc. 1978. "The Tenth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public Attitudes Toward the Public School." Phi Delta Kappa (September).

Rawls, John. 1971. A Theory of Justice. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Riesman, David, and Christopher Jencks. 1968. The Academic Revolution. New York: Doubleday.

Rosenblatt, Roger. 1974. Black Fiction. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Smith, Charles U. 1976. "Teaching and Learning the Social Sciences in the Predominantly Black Universities." In C. V. Willie and R. R. Edmonds (eds.), Black Colleges in America. New York: Teachers College Press.

Smith, Huston. 1976. Forgotten Truth. New York: Harper.

Solmon, Lewis, and Paul J. Taubman. 1973. Does College Matter? New York: Academic Press.

Stanley, Manfred. 1978. The Technological Conscience. New York: Free Press.

Star, John. 1977. "Above All, A Scholar." Change (February):27-33.

Stonequist, Everett. 1937. An Experimental Comparison of Statistical and Case History Methods of Attitude Research. New York: Arno Press. (Presented as a dissertation at the University of Chicago in 1930).

Taylor, Howard F. 1977. "Playing the Dozens with Path Analysis." Pp. 243-250 in Raymond L. Hall (ed.), Black Separatism and Social Reality: Rhetoric and Reason. New York: Pergamon.

Terman, Lewis, and Melita Oden. 1947. The Gifted Child Grows Up. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Terman, Lewis, and Melita H. Oden. 1960. "The Gifted Group at Mid-Life: Fulfillment of Promise." Pp. 823-833 in Jerome M. Seidman (ed.), The Adolescent -- A Book of Readings. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Rev. ed. First published in 1953.

Thompson, Daniel C. 1973. Private Black Colleges at the Crossroads. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Tribble, Israel, Jr. 1979. "A Black Perspective on 'The Case Against' College." The Educational Forum (May):421-427.

Turner, Darwin T. 1964. Katharsis. Wellesley: Wellesley Press.

Turner, Darwin T. 1967. Nathaniel Hawthorne's "The Scarlet Letter." New York: Dell.

Turner, Darwin T. 1968. "The Negro Dramatist's Image of the Universe." Pp. 677-690 in Abraham Chapman (ed.), Black Voices. New York: Mentor Books.

Turner, Drawin T. 1969. "Introduction" in The House Behind the Cedars by Charles W. Chesnut. New York: Collier Books. Originally published 1900.

Turner, Darwin T. 1970. Black American Literature: Essays, Poetry, Fiction, Drama. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill.

Turner, Drawin T. 1971a. In a Minor Chord. Carbondale, Ill.: Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett.

Turner, Darwin T., et al. 1972a. Voices from the Black Experience: African and Afro-American Literature. Boston: Ginn.

Turner, Darwin T., et al. 1972b. The Teaching of Literature by Afro-American Writers: Theory and Practice. National Council of Teachers of English.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1960. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1960. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1979. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1979. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1980. Social Indicators III. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Civil Rights Commission. 1978. Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Labor Department. 1965. The Black Family, A Case for National Action. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wharton, Clifton R., Jr. 1972. "Reflections on Black Intelletual Power." Educational Record (Fall):281-282.

Willie, Charles V. 1979. The Caste and Class Controversy. Bayside, N.Y.: General Hall.

Willie, Charles V. 1979. "The Relative Effects of Race and Social Class on Family Income." Pp. 60-61 in C. V. Willie (ed.), The Caste and Class Controversy. Bayside, N.Y.: General Hall.

Willie, Charles V. 1980. Leadership Development for Minorities. New York: Rockefeller Foundation.

Willie, Charles V. 1981. The Ivory and Ebony Towers. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.

Willie, Charles V., and Ronald R. Edmonds. 1978. Black Colleges in America. New York: Teachers College Press.

Willie, Charles V., and Marlene MacLeish. 1978. "The Priorities of Presidents of Black Colleges." In Charles V. Willie and Ronald R. Edmonds (eds.), Black Colleges in America. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wilson, William Julius. 1978. The Declining Significance of Race. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, William Julius. 1979. "The Declining Significance of Race, Revisited But Not Revised." P. 166 in C. V. Willie (ed.), The Caste and Class Controversy. Bayside, N.Y.: General Hall.

Wright, Richard, and G. Rosskam. 1941. 12 Million Black Voices. New York: Viking.

Appendix

Questions for Personal Interview with Five Black Scholars

1. How did you decide to go into your field?
2. What are your areas of specialization?
3. How did you choose these areas?
4. Please tell me about each of the schools in which you enrolled, why you decided to matriculate, when, and special experiences at each school.
5. Please tell me about each of the jobs that you have had, when and why you worked for a particular organization, particular accomplishment on the job, and reasons why you left.
6. What impediments, if any, did you face in the development of your career?
7. What impediments, if any, do other blacks face today in becoming a professional in your field?
8. What positive experiences enhanced the development of your career?
9. Are there specific things that you would recommend to enhance the career of other blacks in your field?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

290

Refers

Data Sheet for ~~Nominators~~ of Outstanding Black Scholars

Please do not write in this column

ID 1 2 3 4

5 6 7 8

9 10

11

I. Please indicate below information about your current employment and your employment the first year after you received your highest degree

a. current position

Job Title and Rank	Name of Employment Organization	Address City, State	Year of Appointment to this rank	Current Annual Salary (Optional)

b. Which category below best describes your current employment?

☐ 1. Business or industry

☐ 2. Junior college, 2 year college, technical institute

☐ 3. 4 year college or university

☐ 4. federal government agency

☐ 5. state government agency

☐ 6. local government agency

☐ 7. non-profit organization other than educational institution

☐ 8. other, specify ______________________________

☐ 9. not currently in labor force

Please do not write in this column

791

☐

c. What is your current primary work activity?
(Check only one box.)

☐ 1. Research

☐ 2. Teaching

☐ 3. Writing or editing

☐ 4. Consulting

☐ 5. Professional or clinical services to individuals

☐ 6. Administration

☐ 7. Clerical

☐ 8. Other, specify ______________________________

☐ 9. not currently in labor force

☐ 13

d. How satisfied are you with your current position?

☐ 1. very satisfied

☐ 2. somewhat satisfied

☐ 3. not satisfied

☐ 14 15 ☐ 16 ☐ 17

e. First position held after receiving highest degree

☐ 18 19

Job Title and Rank	Name of Employment Organization	Address City, State	Year of Appointment to this job	Beginning Annual Salary (Optional)

Please do not write in this column

|__|
20

f. Which category below best describes your first employment after receiving your highest degree?

☐ 1. Business or industry

☐ 2. Junior college, 2 year college, technical institute

☐ 3. 4 year college or university

☐ 4. federal government agency

☐ 5. state government agency

☐ 6. local government agency

☐ 7. non-profit organization other than educational institution

☐ 8. other, specify ______________________________

☐ 9. not in labor force that year

|__|
21

g. What was your primary work activity at this first position following receipt of your highest degree? (Check only one box.)

☐ 1. Research

☐ 2. Teaching

☐ 3. Writing or editing

☐ 4. Consulting

☐ 5. Professional or clinical services to individuals

☐ 6. Administration

question continued on the back of this page...

Please do not write in this column

g. continued

☐ 7. Clerical

☐ 8. Other, specify ______________________________

☐ 9. not in labor force that year

☐ 22

h. How satisfied were you with this first position at that time?

☐ 1. very satisfied

☐ 2. somewhat satisfied

☐ 3. not satisfied

CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE ....

244

Please do not write
in this column

II. Please provide information on your college and graduate education starting with your undergraduate education. (Include 2-year colleges.)

a.

Institutions Name	Location	Degree (if any)	Year Degree was Received	Field	Years Attended

23 24 25 26 27 28 29

30 31 32 33 34 35 36

37 38 39 40 41 42 43

44 45 46 47 48 49 50

51 52 53 54 55 56 57

294

Please do not write in this column

b. Please indicate sources from which you received money during graduate school. (Check as many boxes as apply.)

☐ 1. Assistantship, fellowship, scholarship or traineeship ☐ 58

☐ 2. G.I. Bill ☐ 59

☐ 3. Own earnings ☐ 60

☐ 4. Spouse's earnings ☐ 61

☐ 5. Family contributions ☐ 62

☐ 6. Loans ☐ 63

☐ 7. Other, specify ________________ ☐

c. Please check the one box below which best describes your status during the year immediately preceding receipt of the doctorate (if applicable) ☐ 65

☐ 1. Not applicable

☐ 2. Held fellowship or assistantship

☐ 3. Supported by research grant

☐ 4. Not employed

☐ 5. Employed part-time

☐ 6. Employed full-time

☐ 7. Studied full-time

Please do not write in this column

III. Personal characteristics

a. Sex

☐ 1. male   ☐ 2. female

66

b. Year of birth: ____________________

67-68

c. State of birth: ____________________

69 70   71

d. Racial/ethnic identification

72-73

☐ 1. U.S. Black

☐ 2. U.S. White

☐ 3. Foreign Black

☐ 4. Foreign White

☐ 5. Puerto Rican

☐ 6. Mexican-American

☐ 7. Other Hispanic

☐ 8. Native American

☐ 9. Asian-American

☐ 10. Other, specify: ____________________

Please do not write in this column

74 75

76 77

78

79

e. Please circle the highest level of education completed by:

your father

	grade	Some College	Completed College	Some Graduate School	Received Graduate Degree
none	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Some College	Completed College	Some Graduate School	Received Graduate Degree

your mother

	grade	Some College	Completed College	Some Graduate School	Received Graduate Degree
none	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Some College	Completed College	Some Graduate School	Received Graduate Degree

f. Which occupational group typically characterized the career of:

your father	your mother
☐ 1. unemployed	☐ 1. unemployed
☐ 2. housekeeping spouse	☐ 2. housekeeping spouse
☐ 3. service worker or laborer	☐ 3. service worker or laborer
☐ 4. semi-skilled or operative	☐ 4. semi-skilled or operative
☐ 5. crafts or skilled	☐ 5. crafts or skilled
☐ 6. clerical worker	☐ 6. clerical worker
☐ 7. sales worker	☐ 7. sales worker
☐ 8. manager or administrator	☐ 8. manager or administrator
☐ 9. professional or technical	☐ 9. professional or technical